

The following-named person to be a chief pay clerk in the United States Coast Guard:  
William E. Sparks

#### IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of subsection 515 (c) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

##### To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Hugh Meglone Milton 2d, O154541, United States Army Reserve.  
Brig. Gen. Charles Edward Hart, O15788, United States Army.  
Brig. Gen. Riley Finley Ennis, O11854, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).  
Brig. Gen. Robert Nicholas Young, O15068, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).  
Brig. Gen. Thomas Sherman Timberman, O15328, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).  
Brig. Gen. Clyde Davis Eddleman, O15842, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).  
Brig. Gen. Thomas Leonard Harrold, O16051, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

##### To be brigadier generals

Col. Robert Alwin Schow, O12180, United States Army.  
Col. Herbert Maury Jones, O12251, United States Army.  
Col. Alfred Eugene Kastner, O14932, United States Army.  
Col. Gilman Clifford Mudgett, O14966, United States Army.  
Col. Charles Lanier Dasher, Jr., O15634, United States Army.  
Col. Marcus Butler Stokes, Jr., O15613, United States Army.  
Col. Joseph Pringle Cleland, O16239, United States Army.

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States to the grade indicated under the provisions of title V of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

##### To be brigadier generals, Medical Corps

Brig. Gen. Earle Standlee, O16530, Army of the United States (colonel, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).  
Brig. Gen. William Edward Shambora, O16540, Army of the United States (colonel, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grade indicated under the provisions of subsection 515 (c) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

##### To be brigadier generals

Col. Don Longfellow, O16708, Medical Corps, United States Army.  
Col. Martin Eugene Griffin, O16537 Medical Corps, United States Army.  
Col. Alvin Levi Gorby, O16546, Medical Corps, United States Army.  
Col. James Ogilvie Gillespie, O16711, Medical Corps, United States Army.

The following-named officer for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States to the grade indicated under the provisions of title V of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

##### To be brigadier general, Dental Corps

Col. Neal Anthony Harper, O4025, Dental Corps, United States Army.

#### CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate August 13 (legislative day of August 1), 1951:

##### PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

##### APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR CORPS

To be medical director (equivalent to the Army rank of colonel), effective date of acceptance

Wilton L. Halverson

To be senior assistant surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance

James J. Callaway	Elaine A. Schwinge
Seymour Levine	Ernest J. Carlson
Francis T. Flood	William M. Lordi
William P. Galen	James F. Alexander
Gerald W. Labiner	Sherman N. Kieffer
Ernest C. Siegfried	Charles S. McCammon
Nicholas L. Petrakis	Robert A. Mayer
Robert Schwartz	Rodrique A. Gravelle
John S. Shuttleworth	Sidney J. Curran
Cleve B. Vaughan, Jr.	Eugene J. VanScott
Page H. Seekford	Charles J. Cherre
John D. Talbert	Vincent J. DePaulo

To be assistant surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of first lieutenant), effective date of acceptance

David C. Miller	Margaret S. Spies
Allan B. Carter	Leonard A. Lewis
Frank L. Weaver, Jr.	Cameron L. Self
Clyton R. Haberman	Donald W. Tharp
Warren H. Proudfoot	Bernard G. Keizer
David J. Crosby	Gordon F. Wise
Melvin R. Davis	

To be senior assistant sanitarian (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance

Harold Lyons

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, AUGUST 13, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and ever blessed God, we thank Thee for this moment of prayer set apart for communion with the great Companion of our souls and the Counselor of our minds.

May we always feel the presence and power of Thy divine spirit, and begin each new day with the prayer, "What wilt Thou have me be and do?"

Grant that we may be inspired to give our best for the most helpful and noblest ways of serving our country and all mankind.

Make us trustworthy and faithful, as we aspire to stand in the glorious tradition of those who sought to do justly, loved mercy, and walked humbly with the Lord.

Hear us in the name of the Christ, our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, August 10, 1951, was read and approved.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Landers, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of

the House is requested, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 311. Joint resolution making a supplemental appropriation for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1952.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1214. An act to authorize and direct conveyance of a certain tract of land in the State of Florida to the St. Augustine port, waterway, and beach district.

#### DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 3973, an act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. WHITTEN, STIGLER, BATES of Kentucky, H. CARL ANDERSEN, HORAN, CANNON, and WIGGLESWORTH.

#### SUSPENDING IMPORT DUTIES ON LEAD

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4948) to suspend certain import duties on lead.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman kindly explain the bill for the benefit of the House.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, this bill suspends the import duties on lead from the day following enactment of the bill until the close of March 31, 1953, or the termination of the present national emergency. The bill also contains a proviso whereby the President is required to revoke the suspension of duties when, for any one calendar month, the average market price of common lead delivered at New York, has been below 16½ cents per pound.

The ceiling price on domestic lead is now 17 cents per pound. Since the outbreak of hostilities in Korea in June 1950, the demand for lead in this country and in the world at large has increased rapidly. This has resulted in a shortage of lead. The United States depends on imports of lead for about one-third of its current requirements.

While the suspension of duties on lead will still not permit United States importers to meet the world price of lead, it is believed that imports will be increased and shortages alleviated to some extent due to the desire of foreign producers to earn dollars and to create or preserve their markets in this country.

It is believed that there will continue to be a shortage of lead in this country for the duration of the suspension under this bill. However, in order to protect domestic producers in the event of unforeseen circumstances which may alleviate the present shortage, the bill contains the above-mentioned proviso requiring the President to revoke the suspension of duties.

The Departments of State, Commerce, and Defense, the Treasury Department, the Office of Defense Mobilization, and the Economic Cooperation Administration, all support legislation which would suspend the import duties on lead.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD explaining a little further the purposes of this bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H. R. 4948 is to suspend the import duties on lead-bearing ores, flue dust, and mattes of all kinds, lead bullion or base bullion, lead in pigs and bars, lead dross, reclaimed lead, scrap lead, antimonial lead, and antimonial scrap lead, which duties are imposed under paragraphs 391 and 392 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

The suspension would apply beginning with the day following the date of enactment of the bill and ending with the close of March 31, 1953, or the termination of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950, whichever is earlier.

The bill also contains a proviso whereby the President shall revoke the suspension of duties when, for any one calendar month, the average market price of common lead for that month, delivered at New York, has been below 16½ cents per pound.

Since the outbreak of hostilities in Korea in June 1950, the demand for lead in the United States and in the world at large has increased rapidly. As a result of this demand, domestic lead prices have risen from 11 cents per pound on June 28, 1950, to 17 cents per pound on January 1, 1951. The Economic Stabilization Agency froze the price of domestic lead at 17 cents per pound and of imported lead at 18½ cents per pound on January 26, 1951.

In 1950 consumption of lead in the United States was 1,220,000 tons, production was 429,875 tons, and 366,500 tons of lead were recovered from scrap. It is estimated by the trade that the United States mine output for 1951 will be somewhat higher than the output of 429,875 tons in 1950, and that the recovery of lead from scrap will be close to the 366,500 tons in 1950.

This country is dependent on imports of lead for approximately one-third of its current requirements. In 1950 imports amounted to 565,152 tons. Since the beginning of 1951, imports of lead have fallen considerably. During January and February imports averaged 22,000 tons per month, compared with average monthly imports of 47,000 tons

during 1950. During these same months consumption of lead continued at the same high rate attained in the last half of 1950.

In order to conserve supplies of lead for defense production, the National Production Authority issued Order M-38, on April 3, 1951, restricting consumers of lead to 100 percent of their average monthly consumption in the first 6 months of 1950, effective May 1, 1951. This order also prohibits consumers of lead from holding in inventory more than 30 days' supply of lead. Even with this order in effect, it appears that the total domestic supplies of lead, including production and imports, will be far short of domestic requirements in the immediate future.

The import duties on lead under the Tariff Act of 1930 are—

First. Two and one-eighths cents per pound on the lead content of lead bullion, base bullion, lead in pigs and bars, and antimonial lead; and

Second. One and one-half cents per pound on the lead content of lead-bearing ores, flue dust, and mattes of all kinds.

The duty on the lead content of scrap lead, antimonial scrap lead, lead dross, and reclaimed lead is 2½ cents per pound. Public Law 869, Eighty-first Congress, suspended the duties on scrap metal—including lead—from October 1, 1950, until the close of June 30, 1951. This suspension was continued to June 30, 1952, by Public Law 66, Eighty-second Congress.

Under the trade agreement with Mexico which went into effect on January 1, 1943, the rates of duty on lead were reduced 50 percent. This trade agreement was terminated on January 1, 1951, and the rates of duty reverted to the rates in the Tariff Act of 1930. Under the trade agreement with Canada which went into effect June 6, 1951—Treasury Decision 52759—the rates of duty on lead have again been reduced by 50 percent.

Although the duties on lead imported for private account were not suspended during World War II, most lead imported was entered free of duty for the account of the Government which allocated lead among domestic consumers.

In the early part of 1948, a severe shortage of lead developed and Congress suspended the import duties on lead from June 20, 1948, through June 30, 1949, by Public Law 725, Eightieth Congress. Your committee believes that again suspending the duty on lead will tend to increase imports into this country.

The price of imported lead is now frozen at 18½ cents per pound. If the duties are again suspended, foreign producers of lead could realize from three-quarters cent per pound to 1½ cents per pound more than they are now receiving on sales of foreign lead in the United States under the current price ceiling. In mid-April, the price of lead from Mexico, which is the principal source of United States imports, ranged from 19 cents to 22 cents per pound, f. a. s. Gulf ports, when sold for export to Europe. Thus, exporters of lead from Mexico

realize more on lead exported to Europe than they realize on sales to the United States.

Although the suspension of duties will still not permit United States importers to meet the world price of lead, it is believed that imports will be increased since payments in dollars for such imports to foreign producers will offset to some extent the differences in price because these producers will be anxious to earn dollars and to create or preserve markets for their products in this country.

Your committee believes that there will continue to be a shortage of lead for the duration of the suspension of duty under the bill. It has, however, in order to protect domestic producers in the event of unforeseen circumstances which may increase the supply of lead to such an extent that the shortage may be alleviated, inserted a proviso in the bill under which the President is required to revoke the suspension of duties when, for any one calendar month, the average market price of common lead delivered at New York, falls below 16½ cents per pound.

The Departments of State, Commerce, and Defense, the Treasury Department, the Office of Defense Mobilization, and the Economic Cooperation Administration have expressed their support of legislation to suspend the import duties on lead. The Treasury Department also advised your committee that it anticipates no unusual administrative difficulties if this bill should be enacted into law. The Bureau of the Budget advised these departments and agencies that it had no objection to the submission of their reports favoring suspension of the duties on lead.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc., That the import duties imposed under paragraphs 391 and 392 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, on lead-bearing ores, flue dust, and mattes of all kinds, lead bullion or base bullion, lead in pigs and bars, lead dross, reclaimed lead, scrap lead, antimonial lead, and antimonial scrap lead shall not apply with respect to imports entered for consumption or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption during the period beginning with the day following the date of the enactment of this act and ending with the close of March 31, 1953; or the termination of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950, whichever is earlier: Provided, That when, for any one calendar month during such period, the average market price of common lead for that month, in standard shapes and sizes, delivered at New York, has been below 16½ cents per pound, the Tariff Commission, within 15 days after the conclusion of such calendar month, shall so advise the President, and the President shall, by proclamation, not later than 20 days after he has been so advised by the Tariff Commission, revoke such suspension of the duties imposed under paragraphs 391 and 392 of the Tariff Act of 1930, such revocation to be effective with respect to articles entered for consumption or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption after the date of such proclamation.*

In determining the average market price of common lead for each calendar month



the Tariff Commission is hereby authorized to base its findings upon the average monthly price of common lead, in standard shapes and sizes, delivered at New York, reported by the Engineering and Mining Journal's Metal and Mineral Markets.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the bill H. R. 4948.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

#### LAPEL BUTTONS FOR NEXT OF KIN OF DECEASED MEMBERS OF WORLD WAR II

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 3911, an act to provide appropriate lapel buttons for widows, parents, and next of kin of members of the Armed Forces who lost or lose their lives in the armed services of the United States during World War II or during any subsequent war or period of armed hostilities in which the United States may be engaged, together with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 2, after "during" insert "World War I."

Page 2, line 3, strike out "II" and insert "II."

Page 2, line 15, after "during" insert "World War I."

Page 2, line 15, strike out "II" and insert "II."

Page 3, line 18, strike out "and."

Page 3, line 18, after "(e)" insert "the term 'World War I' shall include the period extending from April 6, 1917, to March 3, 1921; and (f)."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. HALLECK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain the provision of these amendments?

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 3911 provides appropriate lapel buttons for widows, parents, and next of kin of members of the Armed Forces who lost or lose their lives in the armed services of the United States during World War II or during any subsequent war in period of armed hostilities in which the United States may be engaged.

The authority for issuing gold star lapel buttons for World War II is the act of August 1, 1947. H. R. 3911 reenacted much of that act, and extended the authority to receive lapel buttons to the widows and next of kin of those who lose their lives in Korea and also extends the authority to the widows and next of kin of those who lose their lives following the declaration of national emergency and before the beginning of hostilities of World War II.

There has never been any authority for the issuance of lapel buttons to widows and next of kin who lost their

lives in World War I, and the Senate amendments give this authority.

The additional cost resulting in the Senate amendments cannot be accurately estimated because there is no way of knowing how many people will apply for the lapel buttons. The cost of a button, packaging, and mailing is \$1.25.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### ADVANCE IN CLOTHING ALLOWANCE FOR CADETS, MIDSHIPMEN, AND CADETS IN THE COAST GUARD

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 2736, an act to authorize advances for clothing and equipment to cadets at the Military Academy and to midshipmen at the Naval Academy, and for other purposes, together with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, after line 21, insert:

"Sec. 3. Section 183 of title 14 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"§ 183. Cadets; initial clothing allowance.

"The Secretary may prescribe a sum which shall be credited to each new cadet upon first admission to the Academy, to cover the cost of his initial clothing and equipment issue, which sum shall be deducted subsequently from his pay. Each cadet discharged prior to graduation who is indebted to the United States on account of advances of pay to purchase required clothing and equipment shall be required to turn in to the Academy all clothing and equipment of a distinctively military nature to the extent required to discharge such indebtedness; and, if the value of such clothing and equipment so turned in does not cover the indebtedness incurred, then such indebtedness shall be canceled."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to authorize advances for clothing and equipment to cadets at the Military Academy and the Coast Guard Academy and to midshipmen at the Naval Academy, and for other purposes."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, this bill, affecting the authority of the service academies to authorize an advance in clothing allowances for the cadets and midshipmen, has been amended to include the cadets at the Coast Guard Academy. Present law places a limitation of \$250 upon such advances and in this day and age that sum is completely inadequate. The proposed legislation would remove this limitation. This is not a gift or grant to the midshipmen or cadets, it is merely an advance against future pay and allowances.

The Committee on Armed Services has unanimously approved the amendment which would remove the present \$250 limitation imposed on such advances for Coast Guard cadets.

The only cost involved to the Government in this legislation are the sums that

cannot be collected from cadets and midshipmen who are dismissed or resign from the academies.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, 1952

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the resolution (H. J. Res. 311) making a supplemental appropriation for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1952, with a Senate amendment thereto, and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 9, after "law", insert ": Provided, That in carrying out the provisions of title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as added by the act entitled 'An act to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949,' approved July 12, 1951 (Public Law 78, 82d Cong.), the Secretary of Labor is authorized, without regard to the civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, to appoint Mexican nationals for temporary employment in Mexico for a period of not to exceed 120 days."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. HALLECK. Reserving the right to object, I think the gentleman should explain this matter. I understand this has been cleared with the minority members.

Mr. DENTON. That is correct.

A few days ago, we passed a resolution providing for an emergency supplemental appropriation, for the purpose of putting into operation Public Law 78, commonly known as the wetback law. But when this resolution passed the Senate, an amendment was added which permitted the Government to hire, for a period of 120 days, Mexican nationals in administering the act. The Department of Labor was anxious that this provision be inserted in the resolution. They stated that this was necessary for them to employ clerks and janitors and people in the lower-wage scale. The Department stated that there was an emergency calling for putting the act into effect immediately, and that this amendment, added by the Senate, was necessary to enable them to do so.

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENTON. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, I have seen the amendment and given it consideration, and, as far as we are concerned on this side, I am satisfied it is for the best interests; and I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### REPORT ON H. R. 5113

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H. R. 5113.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

#### DEFENSE HOUSING

Mr. MADDEN, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following resolution (H. Res. 384) providing for the consideration of the bill (S. 349) to assist the provision of housing and community facilities and services required in connection with the national defense (Rept. No. 845) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

*Resolved*, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 349) to assist the provision of housing and community facilities and services required in connection with the national defense. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

#### THE KANSAS FLOOD TRAGEDY

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the tragic and widespread devastation caused by the unprecedented floods in Kansas have left thousands of people homeless, without jobs, and in desperate circumstances. Entire farms have been swept away, and thousands of acres of crops have been destroyed. Businessmen and large industries have been wiped out. The Kansas highway system has suffered nearly \$20,000,000 loss and damage to its bridges and highways. City after city finds itself faced with the insurmountable problem of replacing sewer systems, waterworks, highways, and streets, together with many other expenses involved in the process of digging out.

This catastrophe is a national one, proclaimed by the President to be a major disaster affecting the welfare of the entire country. The loss is not sustained just by the people of Kansas,

Missouri, and Oklahoma. Its tragic effect will be felt by the citizens of all segments of our country. The great loss sustained by our people cannot be measured in dollars. The suffering and hardships can only be imagined after seeing these courageous people bending to the task of rebuilding their homes, farms, and businesses.

This week we will vote upon appropriations for billions of dollars to aid foreign countries in rebuilding their areas devastated by war. Is it too much to ask, Mr. Speaker, that our people at home, who have suffered, be given the same consideration?

I am deeply concerned about the coming recess of the House of Representatives because I am afraid that it will delay important legislation being introduced by me and others to help rehabilitate these devastated areas. I trust that Congress will act upon these measures with speed, because the help is needed now. Delay will be a second tragedy which we here in Congress can prevent by prompt action.

#### STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, during the consideration of the Defense Production Act of 1952, I offered an amendment to take certain strategic and critical materials out from under the ceiling. That amendment carried in the Committee of the Whole but was defeated in the House by a vote of 200 to 214.

This last week the Office of Price Stabilization issued a new regulation exempting certain strategic and critical minerals from price control. It will be remembered that in the House the reason for refusing acceptance of the amendment was that it would list these minerals; and second, that it would raise the price. The minerals are named in the notice that came out and it includes chrome, manganese, and others in the statement issued by the Office of Price Administration. It also indicates that some increase in price may be expected and that this price increase is necessary if these critical and strategic minerals are to be made available. This is the argument I made when I offered my amendment and I am glad to see it supported by DMA in the issue of this regulation. The news story follows:

#### SEVERAL MINOR METALS, MOST FROM ABROAD, RELEASED FROM PRICE CURBS

WASHINGTON.—The Government exempted from price controls several minor metals which come mostly from foreign sources.

The metals are raw asbestos, beryl ores, chrome ores, cobalt ores and metal, columbite-tantalum ores, natural graphite, kyanite and related ores, manganese ores, domestic mercury and acid grade fluorspar. The exemption was effective yesterday under provisions of amendment 4 to General Overriding Regulation 9.

The Office of Price Stabilization said the exemption was made because these are crit-

ical and strategic materials which are in short supply. Exemption was considered necessary to avoid any interference with the flow of supplies to this country, OPS said.

The agency admitted the exemption will increase costs for domestic consumers but said that the increase will have a much less damaging effect than a reduction in supply. The exemption applies to domestic production as well as imports. OPS said it would be too much work to administer domestic price ceilings while foreign supplies were exempt.

The exemption of domestic mercury prices was made because one producer in this country was withholding his supplies of mercury from the market because his ceiling was too low.

#### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following the legislative order of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

#### NOTICE REGARDING SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I have just obtained a 10-minute special order which I intend to use to answer an unwarranted and false charge made against me by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY]. I hope the gentleman from Texas will be present on the floor at that time.

#### NAME IT RICKENBACKER

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I want to read to the House an editorial appearing in the Ohio State Journal of Friday, July 27, 1951, which exactly expresses my sentiments:

#### NAME IT RICKENBACKER

No more appropriate name than Rickenbacker Air Force Base could be given to the huge installation at Lockbourne, 10 miles southeast of Columbus, which contributed so much toward victory in World War II and is now being expanded to meet the new urgent defense needs of the Nation.

Surely the Nation, recognizing the almost unparalleled contribution of Columbus-born Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker to aviation—in time of war and in time of peace—will be solidly behind this move.

Rickenbacker, the Ace of Aces in World War I, carried his hero's role into one of the most useful and exemplary of lives—a lasting hero who has worked untiringly and always intelligently toward the promotion of aviation in all its many and far-flung phases.

The history of aviation and America's hero fliers is kept before the public by Air Force fields all over the Nation—Kelly, Chapman, Randolph, Barksdale, Mitchell, Wright-Patterson, and scores of others. Rickenbacker would be a wise and noble addition to this list.

A great American, Rickenbacker most certainly deserves this honor. And it should come during his lifetime. That fields have been named in the past as memorials need not deter the Air Force in making Rickenbacker the selection.

Rickenbacker's name would lend added prestige and dignity to the Lockbourne base. We hope the Air Force accedes to this move, confident that it will meet the approval of the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, although Eddie Rickenbacker is my long-time personal friend,



I urge naming this field for him, not merely to honor him but to honor his home community and to inspire the Nation.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I want to join the gentleman from Ohio in his tribute to Eddie Rickenbacker, one of the greatest heroes of all time. Certainly that field should be named after him.

Mr. VORYS. I hope you all feel that way and will so express yourselves to the Air Force.

#### MEXICAN LABOR

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a telegram.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, some few weeks ago we passed Public Law 78. The people of my district were pleased that we would be able to obtain Mexican laborers to help with the harvesting of our cotton crop. It now appears that the Department of Labor in making its regulations to carry out this law is making it not only very difficult but in some cases impossible to obtain the relief that we thought we were to attain.

Under the law that we passed it was provided that the Labor Department would be permitted to charge not to exceed \$15 per worker for expenses incurred in bringing these workers in. It now seems that they have set this as the fee that will be charged regardless of what the cost of recruitment and transportation to reception centers has been and, in addition to that, they are setting up, so I understand, regulations to charge \$7.50 for workers who are already in this country and who have been under contract and for whom no additional expense will be incurred. I think that regulation is wrong.

For instance, I am advised that one group of cotton farmers in southeast Missouri arranged for and incurred the expense of transporting approximately 1,000 workers from Mexico who were employed to chop cotton during the cultivation of this crop. In order to provide employment for this group of Mexican workers during the summer in order that they would be available for the harvesting of the crop this fall, this farmer group in southeast Missouri, in cooperation with State and Federal agencies and in order to relieve a labor shortage in the berry and fruit districts of some of the Northern States, made arrangements for the utilization of this Mexican labor during the summer months. Although the cost of transportation from the Mexican border to southeast Missouri was borne by the farmers of my district, it is my understanding that under the regulations which have been approved by the Department of Labor they will be called upon to pay not less than \$7.50

per head for the privilege of using this labor in the harvesting of our cotton crop this fall. It appears that this fee is not only exorbitant but is not justified and, furthermore, in my opinion, it is contrary to the intent of the law passed by Congress in recognition of the urgent need for labor necessary to harvest crops which had been planted at the request of the Secretary of Agriculture in an effort to attain goals believed necessary to the war effort.

Herewith I quote from a telegram received from the Southeast Missouri Harvesting Co., representing a cooperative group of cotton producers in southeast Missouri:

Under Public Law 78, section 502 (2), the bill states employer must agree to reimburse United States Department of Labor for essential expenses incurred for transportation and subsistence of workers in amounts not to exceed \$15 per worker. We understand contract forms and instructions being released to regional offices with regard to this section of bill provide that—

1. Employers recontracting workers now in the States must pay \$15 per head for that privilege.

2. If the employer has men under contract and needs to have worker contracts extended, he must pay \$7.50 per head.

3. Employers must pay \$15 per head for each man contracted at the reception center. This amounts to a flat head tax of \$7.50 or \$15 per man that the Secretary of Labor is charging the farmer.

Testimony of Senator ELLENDER and Congressman POAGE at time bill was being considered by both House and Senate clearly emphasized that under no circumstances was a head tax to be considered. This arbitrary stand for maximum charges on the part of the labor lawyers in the Secretary's office is in complete defiance of the law's intent to charge the farmer for actual expenses for transportation of the worker to the border reception center. Our association recruited 1,000 workers in Mexico for cotton chopping. Our actual recruitment costs, including subsistence and transportation to border, averaged \$2.61 per man. It also appears that labor is determined the American farmer turn every penny of substance he might hope to realize on his efforts in producing essential food and fiber to the other fellow. Costs on our crop to date prohibit us from attempting to harvest it this fall if Secretary Tobin allows this arbitrary action on the part of his employees to stand. Cotton will not be picked in the Mississippi Valley unless you are able to assist in securing relief for us from this exorbitant schedule. We request that the Department be required to sit down with a committee of farmers and work out questions relative to costs and other requirements necessary to operation of contract and program.

SOUTHEAST MISSOURI HARVESTING CO.,  
WALTER ERB, Manager.

I hope that those who have been designated by the Secretary of Labor to conduct this program will reconsider the action taken in announcing the regulations under which the cotton producers in my area contend they will be unable to operate. Already they have made an unprecedented investment in this 1951 cotton crop and have suffered irreparable loss on account of excessive rains which have caused much of this crop to be abandoned and which in turn has caused this to be without a doubt the most expensive cotton crop ever to be produced in southeast Missouri.

#### BOOTS AND SADDLES

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, several months ago I introduced a bill calling for the reactivation of a division of horse cavalry in the Armed Forces. The record of the Russian ground troops in the Crimea and in the Caucasus in the last war, where they used cavalry extensively to turn the German flank, was most effective. Likewise in Korea we have ample testimony that the Chinese and North Koreans are using horse cavalry effectively. Our Army, as usual, say, there is no need for such a thing, and they have to be shown.

Mr. Speaker, I have here an article appearing in the Washington Times-Herald which is headed "Horse marines' back in saddle." The Marines are now reactivating the old horse marines. When the Army tells us that they cannot use horse cavalry and there is no need for it, I say, as usual, "Tell it to the Marines."

"HORSE MARINES" BACK IN SADDLE AT QUANTICO, VA.

(By James Lee)

The "horse marines" are back in business today and the stirring notes of Boots and Saddles once more puts dashing warriors astride spirited steeds at Quantico, Va.

Although the Army nearly a year ago abolished the horse cavalry of proud tradition, the United States Marines have come to the rescue of old dobbin as an instrument of warfare.

The Quantico Marine Corps base has in full gallop a course in the use of the horse in modern combat.

#### PROVED VALUE IN WAR

Marine spokesmen said that regardless of the Army's decision to banish the horse, the need for four-footed beasts of battle and burden was demonstrated in Italy and Burma during World War II and more recently in Korea.

Therefore, a course was set up to teach marine platoon commanders the tactical use of the pack saddle, care of the animal, rough-riding techniques, and the carrying of ammunition and supplies over rugged terrain under combat conditions.

The first class of 25 saddle-sore but elated second lieutenants recently completed the course and a second class with the same number of officers is now going over the jumps.

#### "HORSE MARINES" CITED

Although leathernecks traditionally are saltier than a scupper and generally associated with life on the bounding main, the corps has had plenty of horses in its history.

In times past, many a marine has been yanked from a battlewagon's fo'c's'le to do mounted duty ashore and old-time devil dogs recall with glee the exploits of the "horse marines" in prewar China.

Horsemanship instructors at Quantico point out that crack cavalry brigades are elite components of the Russian army, and that old-fashioned cavalry charges by the Chinese and North Korean Communists have been reported more than once during the present hostilities.

#### CAVALRY BILL OPPOSED

As the thunder of hoofbeats rumble on the plains of Quantico, Congress has before it a bill to reactivate the Army's horse cavalry.

The legislation is opposed by mechanization-minded brass, which told the House Armed Services Committee that "the horse has lost its usefulness on the battlefield."

But the service die-hards—and there are many—who believe the mounted soldier could still be a top-notch fighting man in anybody's war, scornfully retort:

"Tell that to the Marines."

#### CONGRESSMEN'S VOTING RECORDS AND INCOME

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to provide that the Legislative Reference Service shall compile and make available the voting record of Members of Congress, and make available information relative to the income of Members of the House.

I feel that the wide dissemination of a Congressman's voting record should be made so that the people will know where he stands on each and every issue that is brought before the Congress for its consideration and disposal. Mr. Speaker, I feel that to provide more democracy in the operations of the United States House of Representatives, and to more effectively discharge its obligations, Members should file with the Clerk of the House a report containing full and complete statements as to, first, the amount and sources of all income received by such Member during the preceding year, including all fees, salaries, income from trusts or estates, and dividends received or credited to his account, and, if such income is derived from a law firm or partnership, the names of the clients of such firm or partnership from whom fees were received; and, second, all dealings in securities or commodities by such Member, or by any person acting on behalf of, or pursuant to the direction of, such Member during the preceding year.

Under my measure the Clerk of the House will be directed to compile and to publish within 3 weeks after the close of each session of Congress a tabulation of the voting record of its Members on all roll-call votes, together with brief descriptions of the issues voted upon. For the purpose of easy readability and quick reference, each Member's votes shall be gathered in one place. The Superintendent of Documents shall sell copies at cost, and shall print sufficient copies so that a supply is on hand at all times. It is impossible today for any voter to get such information from the Congress without authorization of the Member whose voting record is sought.

It is my hope that the Congress will see fit to consider this legislation and report it favorable at the earliest opportunity.

WILLIAM N. OATIS

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

[Mr. ARMSTRONG addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

#### DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

#### THE LATE STEPHEN T. EARLY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a great American whose death on last Saturday has saddened the Nation.

Stephen T. Early began his distinguished career as a newspaperman and served with the United Press and the Associated Press. His record in this difficult field was notable for his achievements.

I came to know Steve Early very well when he was called to the White House to serve in the capacity of press secretary for President Roosevelt. I know of the high regard and warm friendship in which he was held by our late President. On President's Roosevelt's death Steve Early continued his arduous duties serving President Truman faithfully and with a high sense of duty through some of the most important years of our history. President Truman paid high tribute to him for his splendid service.

During his tenure of office as Under Secretary of Defense, an all-important post to which he was called by President Truman, Steve Early again proved his vision and ability as well as his courage and willingness to follow the course of duty as his contribution to the betterment of our Nation and its citizens.

Steve Early, competent and efficient, gave of himself to his country unselfishly and at great sacrifice. He served his country with ability, courage, honor and distinction.

I personally have lost a close friend and one for whom I had the highest regard and admiration.

Mr. Speaker, I know I voice the sentiments of this House when I extend and express to Mrs. Early and her sons and daughter my deepest sympathy in their great loss and sorrow. I am sure they find comfort in the great work of husband and father. Steve Early will long be remembered for his contributions as a citizen and as a public official. He will long linger in the minds of those who knew him and his outstanding work has left his imprint on the pages of American history.

#### CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 152]

Abblitt	Garmatz	Ostertag
Adair	Gary	Patterson
Addonizio	Gavin	Perkins
Allen, Ill.	Gordon	Philbin
Allen, La.	Gore	Poulson
Anfuso	Granahan	Powell
Barden	Grant	Radwan
Baring	Green	Redden
Barrett	Greenwood	Riley
Bender	Gwinn	Rivers
Bennett, Mich.	Hall	Robeson
Betts	Edwin Arthur	Rodino
Boggs, Del.	Hand	Rogers, Mass.
Boggs, La.	Hart	Roosevelt
Bonner	Hays, Ohio	Sabath
Boykin	Hébert	St. George
Breen	Hedrick	Sasscer
Brehm	Heffernan	Saylor
Burton	Heller	Scott, Hardie
Busbey	Hess	Scott,
Butler	Hinshaw	Hugh D., Jr.
Byrnes, Wis.	Javits	Sheehan
Canfield	Kean	Simpson, Ill.
Carlyle	Kearns	Sittler
Case	Kelley, Pa.	Smith, Kans.
Celler	Kennedy	Staggers
Chatham	Klein	Stanley
Chudoff	Lantaff	Taber
Clemente	Latham	Tackett
Corbett	McCulloch	Taylor
Davis, Tenn.	McDonough	Teague
Dawson	McGrath	Thomas
DeGraffenried	Mack, Ill.	Towe
Dingell	Mason	Watts
Dollinger	Miller, Md.	Welch
Dondero	Miller, N. Y.	Welch
Donohue	Morano	Werdel
Donovan	Morgan	Wharton
Doughton	Morris	Wheeler
Durham	Morrison	Whitaker
Ellsworth	Morton	Wildall
Elston	Moulder	Wigglesworth
Engle	Murray, Wis.	Wood, Ga.
Fallon	Norblad	Wood, Idaho
Fine	O'Brien, Mich.	Yorty
Fogarty	O'Konski	
Furcolo	O'Neill	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 295 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

#### HOOR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

#### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BOW asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes tomorrow, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

#### AMENDING AND EXTENDING THE SUGAR ACT OF 1948

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the



State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4521) to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4521, with Mr. PRESTON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the House Committee on Agriculture is presenting this bill, H. R. 4521, which is a bill to amend the Sugar Act of 1948. I would like to say that the report of our committee was unanimous. I do not recall that any single witness appeared before the committee in opposition to the bill, although we had hearings extending over a period of 7 days.

I feel that by reading some excerpts from the report I can give you succinct information concerning the purposes and provisions of the bill which is now before you, and with your permission I would like to read briefly from the report:

#### GENERAL STATEMENT

The accompanying bill reenacts, with relatively minor changes, the Sugar Act of 1948 which otherwise would terminate on December 31, 1952. The bill extends the act for 4 years, until December 31, 1956. It also amends the Internal Revenue Code by extending the applicability of the excise tax on sugar for 4 years until June 30, 1957. Changes in the Sugar Act are confined to those portions of the law relating to quotas. The major change in quotas is to increase the allocation to Puerto Rico by 170,000 tons annually, and that to the Virgin Islands by 6,000 tons. A quota of 300,000 gallons of liquid sugar is also established for the British West Indies to meet a particular situation in the molasses industry.

The allocation to the various producing areas on the mainland of the United States, and to Hawaii and the Philippine Islands, remains the same as in the existing law. A slight increase is provided in the allocation to foreign countries other than Cuba, which ship sugar into the United States, in order to restore to these countries their prewar ratio of sugar imports. Cuba's percentage share of the import trade in sugar is slightly reduced, but the actual tonnage of sugar which Cuba will ship to the United States is expected to increase, due to the fact that Cuba will receive a fixed percentage quota of an anticipated substantial increase in sugar consumption in the United States.

The provisions of the bill have been worked out in a series of conferences between producer and user groups in the sugar industry, representatives of the various sugar-producing areas, and an interdepartmental committee composed of representatives of the Departments of State, Interior, Commerce, Treasury, Agriculture, and the Tariff Commission. Particular consideration has been given to the matter by the Departments of Agriculture, State, and Interior. In these conferences the interests of the various users and producers were carefully considered by the Government departments concerned and the bill represents a practical and equitable adjustment of those varying, and to some extent conflicting, interests. Many witnesses, representing both Government and industry, appeared before the committee during the 7 days of hearings on the bill, and unanimously recommended its enactment.

A few amendments were proposed but most of these would have had the effect of introducing new matter into the bill, rather than changing its present terms, and even those who proposed amendments indicated their support of the bill as reported, whether the amendments were included or not. The only substantive amendment actually made to the bill (the one providing the liquid-sugar quota for the British West Indies) is a committee amendment and was not proposed specifically by any witness during the hearings. As far as the committee is aware, there is no opposition anywhere to the enactment of this bill.

#### NATIONAL POLICY

Sugar is an essential food product, and it has long been the established policy of the United States Government, for defense and strategic reasons, to preserve within the United States the ability to produce at least a portion of this vital food product needed by American consumers. Due to the cheap labor available in tropical countries where sugar grows most abundantly, and to the fact that sugar (either beet or cane) is produced in some quantity in almost every country in the world, it is probable that little, if any, sugar would be grown in the United States if American producers had to compete on an open world market against the cheap production in other countries.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at this point?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. Of course, we all know that we import most of our sugar from Cuba, but the passage of this legislation will not lessen the imports from that country, will it?

Mr. COOLEY. No, Cuba will probably send in more sugar than formerly.

Mr. SHORT. In fact, we will continue, or perhaps even increase our imports.

Mr. COOLEY. We have slightly increased the quotas for the full duty countries and to some slight degree the quota from Cuba has been reduced, but it is only a slight decrease and will be compensated for by the increased amount of sugar that Cuba will be able to send into the United States due to the increased consumption of sugar in the United States.

Mr. SHORT. And by granting increased quotas to both Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands we will add materially to the economy of those two countries in which we are very much interested and for whom we are more or less responsible.

Mr. COOLEY. That is unquestionably true.

Mr. SHORT. And unless we do help them to help themselves it perhaps would be a drain on the Treasury, more or less, in the form of direct relief.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. SHORT. I want to congratulate the chairman of the committee and the members of this committee on reporting out this legislation, because, in my opinion, it will not increase the cost of sugar in the future. Will it?

Mr. COOLEY. No; definitely not.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. Is it not a fact that what we are doing here today, if we pass this bill, is just continuing a policy that has been in effect for many years and has successfully operated all during that time?

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is accurate in his statement.

With reference to the national policy, I should like to read again one paragraph of this report:

Sugar is an essential food product, and it has long been the established policy of the United States Government—for defense and strategic reasons—to preserve within the United States the ability to produce at least a portion of this vital food product needed by American consumers. Due to the cheap labor available in tropical countries where sugar grows most abundantly, and to the fact that sugar (either beet or cane) is produced in some quantity in almost every country in the world, it is probable that little, if any, sugar would be grown in the United States if American producers had to compete on an open world market against the cheap production in other countries.

I call your attention to the chart on page 3 of the report showing how wages in the United States sugar-producing areas compare with those in other countries.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to observe that this sugar program is a vital part and parcel of our farm program. It has operated so satisfactorily that the average citizen is not aware of the fact that we have a program in existence. Actually there are many Members of Congress who seem not to be aware of the fact that we have had a sugar program in operation for many years. There is one fact that I am certain is not generally known—that this is a part of the farm program which is definitely in the interest of the consumers of America. It is not sponsored by the farmers only or by the producers of sugar beets and sugarcane.

Mr. SHORT. I was going to ask the gentleman that very question. Would the passage of this legislation in any manner or degree injure the growers of sugar beets, particularly in States like Michigan and Colorado or the growers of sugarcane in States like Louisiana?

Mr. COOLEY. In answer to the gentleman's question, I think I would be safe in saying that but for this problem the producers referred to by the gentleman from Missouri would be forced out of business, whereas with this program they are given definite allocations and they are satisfied with the allocations which they will receive under this bill.

Mr. SHORT. I am sure the gentleman from North Carolina and the members of this committee are very eager to do everything in their power to develop our own economy and help our domestic farmers.

Mr. COOLEY. Certainly we are.

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. GOLDEN. How do the quotas permitted under this bill compare with the amount of sugar that has come into this country from foreign countries in the past?

Mr. COOLEY. I call the gentleman's attention to the report, which gives the quantity of sugar that is imported. On page 4 of the report, about midway of the page, appears the following:

In 1950, under this quota system, domestic producing areas supplied 54.08 percent of the sugar consumed in the United States, as follows: Mainland beet and cane areas, 27.39 percent; Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, 12.85 percent; Hawaii, 13.84 percent. The Philippines supplied 5.72 percent; Cuba, 39.46 percent; and all other foreign countries, 0.74 percent.

The changes will result in Puerto Rico being given 170,000 additional tons and the Virgin Islands 6,000 additional tons. The other areas, the beet and cane sugar areas, would remain the same. There will be a slight change in the Cuban quota.

Mr. GOLDEN. The over-all picture, as I understand it, will be that the consuming public will have more sugar coming in under this bill.

Mr. COOLEY. Absolutely. If it were not for this program, it is doubtful, as I pointed out, whether our own producers would be able to stay in business. But for this law, it is highly probable, we would not have an abundance of sugar available to the consumers of this country for the reason that the world market price is substantially above the domestic market price.

Mr. GOLDEN. There is nothing in this bill which would tend to increase the cost to the consumer of sugar?

Mr. COOLEY. No, it would be quite to the contrary. I would like to point out that during the operation of this bill, through all of the emergencies that we have encountered, sugar has been about the cheapest of all foods.

Mr. GOLDEN. Do you think you will be able to maintain that under the operation of this bill?

Mr. COOLEY. Under this bill, yes, sir, I think so.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. It will aid not only Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, but also the people in Hawaii?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes. I think the Delegate from Hawaii and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico were very well pleased with the bill we are presenting.

I think the general public should know the facts about the cost involved in this program. During a recent debate on the floor of the House, and in a recent article which appeared in the Washington Post, only one part of the story was told. They pointed out the tremendous amount of money that had been paid out by the Federal Government to the producers of sugar, when as a matter of fact, they failed to tell that in the over-all operation of this program, the Federal Treasury netted a profit over and above administrative costs of \$230,364,522; and that we have taken that amount from the producers in excess of the amount we have paid back to the producers, and we have enriched the Federal Treasury to the extent of more than \$230,000,000 or an annual profit of approximately \$16,000,000. We have sta-

bilized the price of sugar. We have protected the continental producers and those who produce in Hawaii and Puerto Rico, and we have provided the consuming public with an abundance of this very vital food product. It is strange to me how the public can be so woefully misled, when by making inquiry the public could be well-informed about all parts of this farm program. Before the House recesses, I hope to present a rather comprehensive statement with regard to the over-all operations of the farm program. All of us know that we have sustained substantial losses on commodities like potatoes, eggs, and wool, but I believe when I collect the information, we can show that we have made \$230,000,000 profit on sugar, and approximately \$225,000,000 on cotton, and several million dollars on tobacco. When we put that all together, we actually believe we will come up in the black, and can show an actual profit in the over-all operation of this program which has meant so much to the producers and consumers of this country.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. D'EWART. The gentleman said that the Government has sustained a loss on the wool program. Is that true? My understanding is that the wool program in itself shows a profit.

Mr. COOLEY. I am not sure I have the figure, but my recollection is that we had sustained a loss of approximately \$90,000,000 at one time. How much of that loss has been recovered, I am not in a position to say.

Mr. D'EWART. All the wool that was accumulated during the last war has since been disposed of, and I believe the Government has made a profit over and above the actual acquisition price.

Mr. COOLEY. I am glad the gentleman has called attention to that because, if that is the case, it improves the picture that I am trying to visualize.

Mr. D'EWART. The stock which is now held by the Government is a small amount, which is being held for experimental purposes. All of the stock which was held in warehouses has been disposed of.

Mr. COOLEY. As I say, in preparing my statement, which I will make available to the Members, I will obtain accurate current information as to each commodity and list it in detail so that the public will know that when we come from the Committee on Agriculture we are not asking for subsidies, we are not asking for hand-outs, we are not asking to be placed at any advantage over any other segment of the economy.

I would like to conclude by saying that this bill comes here free from any semblance of partisan politics. As Democrats and Republicans, we have worked like statesmen on this bill, as we try to do on all other bills. Seldom, if ever, do partisan considerations come into our deliberations.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WIER. In reading this bill I find what might be termed a sales tax or a

subsidy. How do you reconcile your position on the basis of the speech you made against subsidies in the control bill and the advocacy of subsidies in this bill?

Mr. COOLEY. This is an entirely different proposition. The subsidy in the control bill was a consumer subsidy, which unfortunately was charged up against Agriculture. If you will look at the record of consumer subsidies during World War II, you will see that it ran into a substantial amount of money.

Mr. WIER. Well, this is a subsidy against the people.

Mr. COOLEY. No; no. It is not. It is a tax imposed on the producer, and it is paid into the Treasury; and then for compliance with these provisions an amount of money is paid back to the producer. But actually the money comes from the producer in the first place. I know that the gentleman comes from a consuming district, but if we did not have this program, the Lord only knows what your consumers would have been paying for sugar.

Mr. WIER. Then we would have the free-enterprise system in full operation.

Mr. COOLEY. And you would be competing with foreign labor. If you will be kind enough to look at the chart as to the cost of labor in the different producing areas, it is very easy to see that the American producer could not stay in business and compete with foreign labor.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has again expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

H. R. 4521 extends the Sugar Act of 1948 for 4 years with some minor changes. All of these changes relate to matters of detail rather than principle. In the main they have been suggested by experience in the administration of the present law or as a result of changed conditions. The most important changes are those relating to quotas.

The allocation to Puerto Rico is increased by 170,000 tons annually and that of the Virgin Islands by 6,000 tons. A new quota of 300,000 gallons of liquid sugar is established for the British West Indies. The other principal change with respect to quotas is contained in the provision which reduces the percentage share of imports from Cuba from 98.64 percent to 96 percent of all imports excepting those from the Philippines, and increases the import quotas for full-duty countries from 1.36 percent to 4 percent of all imports except those from the Philippines. The amount of sugar involved in this change is small, and although the Cuban percentage is slightly reduced, this in all probability does not mean any reduction in the amount of sugar imported from Cuba since all increases in the consumption of sugar in this country will come from the imports from Cuba and the full-duty countries.

I was a Member of Congress and a member of the Committee on Agriculture at the time of the enactment of the Jones-Costigan Sugar Act of 1934. I well recall the chaotic condition which prevailed in the sugar industry in all of its phases both in this country and in



Cuba prior to that time. The enactment of the Jones-Costigan Act was of tremendous benefit to the producers, refiners, and distributors of sugar in this country and in Cuba as well as the consumers of sugar in this country. The act was a compromise between the conflicting interests represented in the industry. It was based upon the principle of give and take between highly competitive groups, all of whom were in severe distress at the time.

Since 1934 the essential principles of the Jones-Costigan Act with some changes in details have been reenacted in the Sugar Act of 1937 which was extended through various enactments until December 31, 1947, and by the Sugar Act of 1948 which became effective on January 1 of that year.

This sugar legislation has been extremely successful. It has resulted in stabilizing the industry. It has enabled it to recover from a condition of prostration in 1934 to a condition of economic soundness and prosperity at the present time. These benefits to producers and distributors have not been at the expense of consumers. In fact consumers have shared in the benefits of the act fully as much as have producers.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I wish to state briefly my own observation while in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands nearly 2 years ago on a study there by the Committee on Ways and Means, a study of the social-security program as applied to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. Our observation there at that time was that much of the economy of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands depends on the quantity of their sugar marketed in the United States, of course; and their greatest need was an increase in their sugar quota. As I recall our observation at that time the increase desired and needed by them was very much in accord with the action you have taken in this proposed legislation in increasing the quota allocated to Puerto Rico by 170,000 tons annually and in increasing the quota allocated to the Virgin Islands by 6,000 tons annually. I want to commend the committee very highly on taking the action you have taken in this bill with reference to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

Mr. HOPE. I thank the gentleman, and I believe that the increase which has been granted to Puerto Rico will greatly assist that area in stabilizing its economy and will afford an outlet for a substantial increase in sugar production over what it has been in the past.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I agree with the gentleman absolutely.

Mr. HOPE. I am very happy that we were able to make that increase, and it can be done without taking anything from any other area because there has been a consistent increase in consumption due to population increases.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. WIER. I wish to ask a question in connection with the matter raised by

the gentleman from Iowa. About 2 weeks ago the Committee on Education and Labor had before it a bill to increase the school-lunch program, or to permit them in Alaska, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands in view of the fact that Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands are part of this country and entitled to some recognition. I remember that the delegates from those three areas appeared before our committee on behalf of their school children, their schools, and their economy in the matter of providing an adequate free school-lunch program. I remember the Delegate from Puerto Rico—I see him sitting here—raised the question that the economy of Puerto Rico was dependent a good deal upon the very subject that is before the House today. They have considerable room for expansion of their sugar production and refining. On the basis of that being the principal industry of the island on which they are dependent to a great degree for funds to operate their schools, and so forth, if I understood the question of the gentleman from Iowa and the gentleman's answer, you have increased the amount of the sugar quota for Puerto Rico. Is that correct?

Mr. HOPE. Yes. The quota of Puerto Rico was increased by 170,000 tons and while that perhaps is not all that Puerto Rico would have liked to have received, I presume no one area has gotten everything it desired. It is a substantial increase and will help a very great deal in stabilizing the economy on that area.

In his statement at the hearings before the Committee on Agriculture, Lawrence Myers, the Director of the Sugar Branch of the Production and Marketing Administration of the Department of Agriculture summarized the results which have been brought about by the 1934 Sugar Act and subsequent legislation. I call particular attention to the following paragraphs taken from Mr. Myers' statement before the committee on June 27 and found on pages 6 and 7 of the printed hearings:

The Jones-Costigan Sugar Act of 1934 and the Sugar Act of 1937 constituted the major means by which our domestic sugar industries and the sugar industry of Cuba were brought from severe economic depression to full recovery. During the war the payment provisions under the Sugar Act helped to maintain production in the face of rising costs and controlled sugar prices. Since the war, the Sugar Act of 1948 has largely stabilized domestic sugar prices. In 1948 and 1949 it helped to keep our domestic prices from falling unduly. During the past year the Sugar Act has been given the new role of keeping domestic prices below the world level. In recent weeks while world raw-sugar prices were shooting upward to over 8 cents per pound, f. a. s. Cuba, the rise in domestic prices was moderate.

Some comparisons between 1933, the last year before the sugar legislation was put into effect, and 1950 will demonstrate a few of the benefits that have been derived from our sugar legislation.

The average retail price of refined sugar rose from 5.3 cents per pound in 1933 to 9.75 cents per pound in 1950, a rise of 84 percent. The duty-paid price of raw sugar in New York also rose by 84 percent. The price of all foods, however, rose by 143 percent. Therefore, the rise in prices of sugar to consumers has been only about 60 percent as

much as the rise in prices of foods as a whole.

In contrast with the rise of 84 percent in the price of sugar, returns to domestic growers per ton of sugar beets and sugarcane increased by around 170 percent. In other words, the increase in grower returns per unit was twice as large as the increase in the price to consumers.

Since domestic producers have also shared in this country's increased consumption, total returns of sugar-beet and sugarcane growers have risen from approximately \$133,000,000 in 1933 to \$432,000,000 in 1950, a rise of 225 percent.

Average wage rates for field labor in the domestic sugar-beet and sugarcane areas in 1950 were 393 percent of the 1934 level.

The most striking effects of our sugar legislation concern Cuba. In 1933, Cuban producers received 1.1 cents per pound, f. a. s., for sugar shipped to the United States; in 1950, they received 5.1 cents per pound, an increase of 360 percent. Imports from Cuba rose from 1,552,000 tons in 1933 to 3,264,000 tons in 1950. The income Cuba received from sugar shipped to the United States in 1950 was nine times as large as it was in 1933. Incidentally, the value of United States exports to Cuba in 1950 was more than 18 times the value of such exports in 1933.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. D'EWART. I think the largest percentage was to the cane growers, not to the beet growers. I believe the figure for beet growers is 84 percent.

Mr. HOPE. Well, I have not broken down the figures, but there was a substantial increase as far as returns are concerned to both groups during that period of time. Also, of course, the domestic growers have had a share in the increased consumption.

To those who are interested I recommend the reading of Mr. Myers' complete testimony before the committee which will be found in three parts on pages 3, 13 and 269 of the printed hearings.

May I say in passing that I was personally very much impressed with Mr. Myers' statement and with the manner in which he has administered the Sugar Act since taking over the position of Director of the Sugar Branch. I have heard many other members of the committee make similar comments with respect to Mr. Myers and his work.

In the hearings before the committee a large number of witnesses were heard, none of whom were in disagreement with the fundamental provisions of this bill. These witnesses represented producers, both domestic and foreign, importers, refiners, distributors, labor organizations, and consumers, as well as representatives of Government agencies and Members of Congress. The act has the full support of the Department of Agriculture, the Department of the Interior, and the Department of State, all of which by reason of the wide ramifications of the sugar industry at home and abroad are seriously concerned with this legislation. Various witnesses made suggestions covering minor amendments, but none of them, as my recollection goes, had anything but praise for the purpose and general principles involved in the legislation.

The bill as introduced was the result of conferences between all segments of the industry and the Government departments concerned. It probably does not represent a perfect bill in the eyes of many of those who are affected by it, but in my opinion it constitutes a compromise which is fair to the sugar industry in all of its aspects and to sugar consumers.

I think that it is proper at this time to say that I know of no legislation on the statute books which goes any further than does the present Sugar Act or the pending bill in the protection of the consumer. Nor do I know of any legislation which goes further than the 1948 act and the pending bill in the protection of the workers engaged in the industry. I call particular attention to the provisions prohibiting the employment of child labor and those that require that growers must pay laborers wages at least equal to those determined to be fair by the Secretary of Agriculture.

I do not say that this bill is a perfect piece of legislation, but I do say it goes as far as any piece of legislation can go in dealing with the many competitive and conflicting interests, both national and international, involved in the production and distribution of sugar, and at the same time it fully protects the interests of consumers. There are many interested groups who would like to have slight changes in the bill which would be a direct benefit to them. If any element of the industry were writing the bill the details would undoubtedly be a little different, but in the over-all as a reconciliation of many conflicting interests, the bill is a good piece of legislation and should be enacted.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. This is the best example that I know of of cooperation between governments and industry to stabilize their business. My observations are based on what I know about my own district, which has four sugar refineries, and many, many beet-sugar growers. Since 1934 they have had complete stability, not only in the processing plants, but also on the ranches that raise the beets.

Mr. HOPE. I agree thoroughly with what the gentleman has said. I do not know how well a plan like this would work in any other industry. The sugar industry is peculiar in many ways, but in this particular instance the cooperation between Government and business and between the different elements in the industry has, in my opinion, constituted an example of business statesmanship which perhaps has had no equal anywhere.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has again expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER].

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take much of the Committee's time, as the bill has been thoroughly explained by the distinguished

Chairman of the Committee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE]. But I do want to express my appreciation to the Committee on Agriculture for the consideration that has been given to this problem and the expeditious manner in which it has been presented to the House.

Mr. Chairman, the bill which we are considering will continue until the end of 1956 the sugar quota plan which was adopted in 1934. This plan is a substitute for relying upon a tariff on sugar to protect our domestic sugar industry.

The Jones-Costigan Sugar Act was passed in 1934 when it had become clearly evident that our tariff on sugar was not accomplishing the purposes for which it was intended. Our domestic sugar-producing areas were in a severely depressed condition and conditions in Cuba were chaotic, threatening to blow up the economic and political organization of that country.

The Jones-Costigan Sugar Act established a system of sugar quotas to regulate the quantity of sugar which could come into our market from each domestic and foreign area. It provided that the tariff rate on sugar would be reduced by the amount of an excise tax to be put into effect. At the time the tariff rate on Cuban sugar was 2 cents a pound, the excise tax was set at half a cent a pound, and the tariff reduced to one and a half cents. Since that time, through successive trade agreement negotiations, the rate of the import tariff on sugar has been greatly reduced. It now is only a half a cent a pound.

With the tariff at this very low rate, our domestic sugar industry would be virtually without protection if the sugar quota system were not continued. Moreover, our sugar-beet and sugarcane farmers cannot make plans for their future farming operations unless they know what the Government is going to do to protect their industry.

This point is well illustrated by the fact that a sugar-beet farmer who plants a crop of sugar beets early in the spring of 1952 will be dependent for his returns from that crop upon sugar prices up to the late fall of 1953.

Our present sugar program has been eminently successful. Sugarcane and sugar-beet farmers have, on the whole, received satisfactory returns for their crops, the position of sugar factories has been stabilized, and at the same time consumers have been provided an adequate supply of sugar at very reasonable prices. In fact, sugar has continued to be the housewife's cheapest food.

One outstanding fact about this part of our farm support program—the Sugar Act—is that it not only has never cost the Government a single penny but, on the contrary, the sugar excise tax has yielded about \$16,000,000, on the average, each year since the program began. This has amounted to a total of about \$230,000,000 in net revenue to the Government.

The committee hearings on this bill, at which every interested person was urged to express his views, showed that none was opposed to the enactment of

this bill. Accordingly I urge all Members to support it.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado, [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I, too, will not impose on the committee's time, since there is no opposition to the bill, but I would like to mention a few things about the sugar business itself.

Mr. Chairman, sugar is one of our most important foods. On the average, it supplies about 18 percent of our total food-energy needs. We in the United States consume nearly one-fourth of all the commercial sugar produced in the world, far more than is consumed in any other country. We produce in our several domestic areas somewhat more than one-half of the sugar we consume. Nevertheless, we are the largest importer of sugar in the world.

Because of these facts, our sugar-program legislation is of great importance. It is important to all of us as consumers and to many thousand farmers and workers in sugar factories and other branches of the industry. It also is very important in our foreign-trade relations. Thus sugar legislation must give full consideration to all of these interests, balancing any conflicting aspects, and providing a sugar policy and program which will best serve the consumers as well as the producers.

I felt this objective had been achieved in the sugar-quota legislation which was first enacted as the Jones-Costigan Act in 1934. This was replaced by the Sugar Act of 1937 which in turn was replaced by the Sugar Act of 1948. This act will expire on December 31, 1952. The bill which we are considering will extend this law for an additional 4 years with certain changes in some of its provisions.

Extension of the Sugar Act at this time, and for a period of 4 years, will be of great help to farmers in planning their crop rotations and in general farm practices. It will also give assurance of stable conditions for consumers and industrial users of sugar. This legislation assures them that there will be an adequate supply of sugar at fair and reasonable prices.

The chief features of the present Sugar Act and of those which preceded it are, briefly:

First. A system of annual quotas governing the quantity of sugar to be supplied to our market by each domestic and foreign area.

Second. Limitations on the quantities of sugar which can be brought into the continental United States in refined form.

Third. An excise tax of one-half of a cent a pound, raw value, on all sugar.

Fourth. Provision for conditional payments to domestic producers of sugar beets and sugar cane. In connection with this provision it should be borne in mind that receipts from the tax on sugar have exceeded these payments by an average of \$16,000,000 a year—a total of \$230,000,000 since 1934.

Fifth. Provisions for the establishment of minimum wage rates for workers on sugar beet and sugar cane farms and for minimum prices for sugar beets and sugar cane.



The bill we are considering will make relatively minor amendments in the present law, and extend it for 4 years. The chief changes will be to increase the quota of Puerto Rico by 170,000 tons, that of the Virgin Islands by 6,000 tons, and the quotas for the so-called full-duty countries, that is, foreign countries other than Cuba and the Philippines, by a small amount. No change will be made in the quotas of the beet-sugar area, the mainland cane-sugar area, or Hawaii. Likewise, no change will be made in the tax and payment provisions nor in those relating to the determination of sugar consumption requirements. To correct a technical defect in the act, a quota will be provided for liquid sugar from the British West Indies.

In the committee report which is before you, there are some graphic illustrations of the benefits which this sugar legislation has helped to promote. The first chart, which is on page 3, shows that the farm workers in most of our domestic sugar areas receive far higher wages than do such workers in most foreign countries. At the same time, as the chart on page 8 shows, the price of sugar to the consumer is cheaper in the United States than in most foreign countries. On page 11 is a chart which shows that sugar in this country has remained lower over the years in relation to price than any other food. This chart also shows our average per capita consumption of sugar has steadily increased. It is higher than in most foreign countries—about three times the world average. Thus, it is clearly evident that our sugar program has proven to be of great benefit both to producers and to consumers.

As the committee states in its report, this bill was approved unanimously by the committee.

To continue, let us discuss for a moment one of the questions that always arises when we are considering the Sugar Act, and that is, our import and export relations with Cuba. In 1930 the United States Tariff Act set the rates of 2 cents per pound in raw sugar from Cuba and 2½ cents per pound on raw sugar from foreign countries. These rates were intended to give adequate production to our domestic-sugar industry as well as guard it against depressions. However, our sugar industry went further and deeper into depression and large inventories of sugar accumulated. Beet and sugarcane growers were in financial difficulties. Wages for workers in both cane and beet fields were low and prosperity seemed a long way off. By 1933 it was evident that the tariff was no longer adequate to protect our domestic sugar industry and further it was evident that the financial position in our agricultural sugar-producing areas was affecting both our export and import trade.

In 1934 the Congress developed and passed the Jones-Costigan Sugar Act. The bill we are considering contains the general features and operates much the same way as the original Jones-Costigan sugar legislation.

When the Sugar Act of 1948 was passed by this Congress our domestic sugar-producing areas, beet and cane, were placed under fixed quotas as was also

the Philippines, and should there be deficits in our domestic areas, 98.64 percent of our necessary sugar requirements would all go to Cuba and 1.36 percent to the full-duty countries. The full-duty countries you will find listed on page 103 of the hearings. Table No. 5 gives you the basis on which the full-duty countries basic quota was prorated under the 1936 regulation and table 6 gives the quotas which would result for each of the principal full-duty countries as effected by the recommended changes of the 1948 Sugar Act.

Cuba imported into the United States in 1933 1,550,000 tons of sugar and under the 1948 act it had increased to 3,150,000 tons. Its quota duty under the act now in operation is 2,640,000 tons. Cuba has increased its sugar production, as you will note by table 4, page 103, of the hearings, from 3,379,000 short tons of raw sugar in 1937 to 6,384,000 in 1951. Certainly this does not indicate that Cuba is having any trouble in producing sugar and disposing of it. I think after examining these tables and figures everyone must agree that we have treated Cuba fairly well and the change we are suggesting—dropping Cuba from 98.64 down to 96 percent of the possible deficits in quotas from full-duty countries is not of sufficient importance to cause any disturbance in our trade relations with Cuba.

Using a hypothetical case, under the present act should the world deficit on continental and mainland areas, including Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands amount to 750,000 tons, Cuba would receive 98.64 percent of the deficit, amounting to 739,800 tons. While under the new proposal of this act Cuba would receive 96 percent of the 750,000-ton deficit or 720,000 tons. The difference being only 19,800 tons.

On pages 15 to 18 of the hearings, in the testimony given by Lawrence Meyers, Director, Sugar Branch, PMA, United States Department of Agriculture, you will find a complete breakdown of the changes in the Sugar Act offered by this legislation.

Pages 70 and 71 contain a very interesting discussion by Mr. Meyers as to the rise of the world sugar production in the past 100 years. You will note that the world production 100 years ago was about 3,000,000 tons—today it is over 40,000,000. Cane-sugar production rose during that time from 2,500,000 tons to 25,000,000, while beet-sugar production rose from zero to 15,000,000 tons.

Quote page 71:

World sugar production has been increased not only by natural growth, but by subsidies in many countries, particularly the beet countries. Some countries even have direct and indirect export subsidies which force supplies into world markets at depressed prices. We have, of course, also the very, very low wage rates that prevail in many of the tropical areas. All these forces had a tremendous impact on world prices and brought the world sugar economy to its knees before the war, even before the depression of the 1930's.

In a table, published by a Senate committee on the utilization of farm crops, is found an interesting table showing the change in food habits since 1909. I en-

close as part of my remarks a news release I made on this table. Sugar and sirups—exclusive of use in condensed milk, processed fruits and vegetables—rose from 84 pounds per capita in 1909 to as high as 124 pounds in 1930, dropping back to 106 pounds in 1949:

#### REPORT FROM WASHINGTON

(By Congressman WILLIAM S. HILL, Second District, Colorado, July 23, 1951)

#### CHANGING FOOD CONSUMPTION ALTERS MARKET DEMANDS

The Bureau of Agricultural Economics recently published statistics showing important changes in the pattern of consumer food consumption. Foods showing the greatest decrease in consumption are so-called staple products. The per capita consumption of cereal products has decreased from 296 pounds in 1909 to 173 in 1949. Potato consumption was 204 pounds per person in 1909, but in 1949, 112. An "apple a day" seems to be a thing of the past, for while we were consuming 55.5 pounds of apples per person in 1909, we now use only 30.8 pounds.

Dairy products (excluding butter) increased in consumption from 388 pounds per person in 1909 to 429 pounds in 1949; citrus fruits and tomatoes from 44 pounds in 1909 to 98 pounds per person in 1949; leafy green and yellow vegetables (including fresh) from 76 pounds per person in 1909 to 111 pounds in 1949; sugar from 84 pounds per person in 1909 to 106 pounds in 1949; coffee, tea, and cocoa from 10 pounds per person in 1909 to 19 pounds in 1949.

In spite of all the changes as indicated the retail weight equivalent of food consumed per person remained practically static. In 1909 we ate 1,576 pounds per person, and in 1949 it was 1,573 pounds. No doubt the decline in the use of human muscle power and the increase of mechanical devices are reflected in the consumption of the various kinds of food.

The preparation of milk for retail consumption has been one of the outstanding developments of the past 25 years. In 1945 milk consumption reached an all-time high of 337 pounds per person. In 1909 we consumed 274 pounds per person. Evaporated milk was consumed at the rate of 1.4 pounds in 1909, and increased to 17.7 pounds per person in 1949.

These changes in consumption habits are having a profound impact on farm production. We now have specialization in agriculture and the production of specific foods by geographic areas. Also, modern transportation and refrigeration of fresh fruits and vegetables throughout the year supply consuming areas effectively.

Home refrigeration and public frozen food lockers provide a handy supply of fresh meat, fruit, and vegetables. Modern improvements in the processing and packaging of food are changing the food habits of our people.

That is important, too. We change our food habits, and when you change your food habits you change your agricultural production habits, agricultural activities, agricultural products, agricultural sales. So we have been doing that in a remarkable degree.

As part of my remarks I wish to insert a part of this table. Sugar and sirups, exclusive of sugar used in condensed milk or processed fruits and vegetables, rose from 84 pounds per capita in 1909 to as high as 124 pounds in 1930. It dropped back to 106 pounds in 1949.

I hope the passage of this bill will be unanimous.

I promised to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Montana, and I shall be glad to yield now.

Mr. D'EWART. How does the Secretary arrive at the quota for domestic production and for the free-duty countries?

Mr. HILL. The law provides that by a certain date the Secretary of Agriculture, in connection with his advisers, is to meet and go over the whole situation, taking into consideration certain elements as then found, as well as the increase in population, and to determine what the amount of consumption of the entire United States will be the next year.

Mr. D'EWART. How does he determine that consumption in the United States?

Mr. HILL. The only thing he can go by, and I believe the law provides that he must take into consideration the figures that he has in the past as to what the consumption has been, and from that he arrives at what the consumption will be in the United States the next year. I do not think he has missed it on very many occasions.

Mr. D'EWART. How does he finally get to the price of sugar?

Mr. HILL. That is the important question. I might say, as the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] mentioned a moment ago, the way the sugar program has been handled it is not a subsidy program, because he must come to these two conclusions which the gentleman has mentioned: First, he must determine what the consumption will be in the United States. Then, after that, he must take into consideration the provision of the old Costigan-Jones Act, which was section 201, and read like this:

October 31 next preceding the calendar year for which the determination is being made, and shall make allowances for a deficiency or surplus in inventories of sugar, and for changes in consumption because of changes in population and demand conditions, as computed from statistics published by agencies of the Federal Government; and, in order that such determinations shall be made so as to protect the welfare of consumers and of those engaged in the domestic sugar industry by providing such supply of sugar as will be consumed at prices which will not be excessive to consumers and which will fairly and equitably maintain and protect the welfare of the domestic sugar industry, the Secretary, in making any such determination, in addition to the consumption, inventory, population, and demand factors above specified and the level and trend of consumer-purchasing power, shall take into consideration the relationship between the prices at wholesale for refined sugar that would result from such determination and the general cost of living in the United States as compared with the relationship between prices at wholesale for refined sugar and the general cost of living in the United States obtaining during 1947 prior to the termination of price control of sugar as indicated by the Consumers' Price Index as published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Is there any increased quota in this bill for the United States?

Mr. HILL. The domestic quotas for the United States, both for beet and cane sugar, are not changed or molested.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. We have some new irrigated acreage in my district. Some GI's would like to grow sugar beets. How do they get a quota to raise sugar beets in this new area?

Mr. HILL. Strange as it may seem, in 1951—and that should be late enough—the acreage planted to sugar beets in 1951 is 26 percent below the usual acreage of sugar beets.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I desire to compliment and commend the Committee on Agriculture and its distinguished chairman for bringing in a bill that the industry seems to be agreed upon. I am particularly interested in this legislation for the reason that in my district we grow around 30,000 acres of sugarcane and produce around 110,000 tons of sugar. Now, that is a lot of sweetening. We are very pleased with the action of the committee in reporting out this bill.

If the Sugar Act were to expire without being replaced with an effective substitute, we would be forced to return to a policy of tariff protection despite its recognized inability to protect consumers, and its demonstrated inadequacies for the protection of sugar producers. The proposed act is a result of years of study and experience. Its ability to protect consumers as well as producers has been demonstrated, and it has been a most effective instrument in guaranteeing to farmers and laborers in the field the same benefits afforded industry.

The legislation embodied in this act, in my opinion, constitutes the most desirable method that has yet been developed for dealing with our domestic sugar problems. Comparisons between 1933, the year before our sugar legislation was first adopted, and 1950, will demonstrate a few of the benefits that have been derived from sugar legislation. The average retail price of refined sugar rose from 5.34 cents per pound in 1933 to 9.75 cents per pound in 1950, a rise of 84 percent. The price of all foods, however, rose by 143 percent. The rise in the price of sugar to consumers has only been about 60 percent as much as the rise in prices of foods as a whole. In contrast with the rise of 84 percent in the price of sugar, returns to domestic growers per ton of sugar beets and sugarcane increased around 170 percent. In other words, the increase in grower returns per unit was twice as large as the increase in the price to consumers. Total returns of sugar beet and sugarcane growers have risen from approximately \$133,000,000 in 1933 to \$432,000,000 in 1950, a rise of 225 percent. Average wage returns for agricultural labor in domestic sugar beet and sugarcane areas in 1950 were 393 percent of the 1934 level.

An excise tax of 50 cents per hundred pounds and an import compensating tax at the same rate are applied to sugar in order to operate the program and

equalize the cost of production in domestic and foreign areas. From the funds thus obtained, payments are made to domestic producers at a basic rate of 80 cents per hundred pounds of sugar, raw value, for the first 350 short tons of sugar produced on a farm and reduced progressively thereafter to a minimum of 30 cents per hundred pounds. Payment is made only to farmers who have complied with the provisions of the act.

Financially, this sugar program is unique—it not only pays for itself but it provides a net average annual profit to the Government of approximately \$16,000,000.

The passage of this proposed legislation will insure the people of Florida greater prosperity for the next 4 years. The sugar industry of my State employs directly and indirectly approximately 12,000 persons with an annual payroll in excess of \$3,000,000. The value of the crop at present-day prices is approximately \$20,000,000 annually.

Such a program to me seems well worth while. I urge its adoption.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS] such time as he may desire.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, the Sugar Act of 1948 will expire on December 31, 1952. It has been decided, however, that the act should be extended by legislation adopted during the present session of Congress. The act is being extended now in order to enable the sugar producers in the domestic and foreign areas who supply our consumption in the United States to plan their production programs with the prior knowledge of an assured market during 1953 under the safeguards of sugar legislation.

Accordingly, the Sugar Act is being extended for 4 years; that is, from December 31, 1952, through December 31, 1956.

Sugar is such an essential food product that it has long been the established national policy of our Government to preserve within the United States the ability to produce an assured portion of this commodity. Due to the cheap labor available in tropical countries where sugar grows most abundantly, and to the fact that sugar is produced in at least some quantity in almost every country in the world, it can be easily understood, I think, that only a small portion of our requirements would be grown here if American producers had to compete on an open world market against the cheap production in other countries.

The history of our efforts to effectuate this national policy of preserving the production in the United States of a fair portion of our requirements goes back almost to the first days of our Republic. For many years tariff barriers were maintained against importation of sugar from other countries. The use of the tariff device as a means of assuring a fair portion of the market to local producers, however, had disadvantages which frequently overbalanced the expected benefits to our growers at home. Experience demonstrated that at times high tariffs had the effect of arbitrarily



increasing the price of sugar to consumers in the United States; and during other periods when sugar was most needed such barriers adversely affected the normal flow of adequate supply from foreign sources. At the same time, the price that the farmer and the sugar mill received was guided solely by the fluctuation of the world market in sugar. After struggling for more than a century with the tariff system; sometimes too high, sometimes too low, depending upon the administration in power and world conditions beyond our control, a quota system was written into law in the first Sugar Act of 1934, later revised and amended in the Sugar Acts of 1937 and 1948. Under the quota system, devised by the Sugar Acts, the Secretary of Agriculture is required in December of each year, based on available statistics and past performances, to estimate the quantity of sugar that will be consumed during the succeeding year in Continental United States. Then, with this estimate as a starting point, the Sugar Act provides a specific formula whereby the sugar producing areas are respectively given a quota or a fair share of the quantity of the sugar they can produce and supply to meet our requirements. The act provides for two types of quotas, namely: fixed quotas and variable quotas. Fixed quotas are allocated to the mainland beet area and the mainland cane area; and to Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and the Republic of the Philippines. For instance, the quota of the mainland beet area is fixed by law at 1,800,000 tons, and the mainland cane quota is fixed by law at 500,000 tons of sugar per year. In other words, we get the first bite at the cherry, or the right to produce each year a fixed and guaranteed portion of our domestic requirements. The Sugar Act then provides that all United States requirements over and above fixed quotas shall be supplied by Cuba and full duty countries. Since the Cuban and full duty country quotas make up the surplus of our requirements after the fixed quotas are taken care of, such quotas vary from year to year and hence are called variable quotas. Because of our pleasant relationship with Cuba, however, the act guarantees that Cuba shall supply 96 percent of our supply over and above fixed quotas, and the other 4 percent is distributed to full-duty countries.

As I have explained, our consumption estimate is made in December of each year and based on it, the domestic and foreign producing areas are given quotas or shares of our consumption for the next succeeding year. As might be expected, it sometimes happens that certain areas find themselves unable to deliver their quotas. This is particularly true of the Philippines. So-called deficits thus arise and these deficits must be made up and reallocated to other producing areas. Again, Cuba is made the greatest beneficiary of these deficits. For example, the new legislation guarantees to Cuba the right to make up 95 percent of any Philippine deficit, and the other 5 percent of any possible deficits is distributed to full-duty countries.

Because of these obvious advantages set forth in the Sugar Act, Cuba remains our greatest source of foreign supply of sugar. Thus, in 1950, Cuba supplied 39.46 percent of the sugar consumed in the United States.

Finally, the Sugar Act as extended continues in effect the excise tax of 50 cents per hundred pounds on the refining of sugar and the import tax of 50 cents per hundred pounds on sugar coming in from Cuba and other areas. Nation-wide, these excise and import taxes of \$1 per hundred pounds have produced an average of a little over \$76,000,000 per year. Part of the funds thus obtained is used to pay bonuses to farmers who comply with their marketing quotas and the balance goes into the Treasury of the United States. Payments to farmers throughout the United States and expenses of administration have averaged about \$61,000,000 per year, leaving a balance of almost \$16,000,000 which goes into the Treasury of the United States. In other words, the sugarcane program as designed in the Sugar Act has resulted in a net profit of about \$16,000,000 per year to our Government.

Now, while the Sugar Act is being extended for 4 years, it is well to reflect upon and realize what the sugar industry means to Louisiana and what the sugar legislation means to the industry in my State. This is doubly important to the Third Congressional District of Louisiana, which I have the honor to represent in the Congress of the United States, because my district is generally regarded as the sugar bowl of the United States so far as cane sugar is concerned.

The sugar industry of Louisiana is composed of the following: 55 raw-sugar mills, 4 sugar refineries, 8,000 sugarcane growers.

Last year's crop brought to Louisiana in excess of \$70,000,000, and of that amount, approximately \$50,000,000 was distributed at the farm level. The industry provides direct employment on a year-round basis for more than 30,000 persons, and during the harvest season, employment for an additional 12,000 persons. Indirect employment on a very conservative basis is afforded to approximately four persons for every one directly employed, and on that basis, would provide direct and indirect employment for approximately 166,000. Included in this indirect employment are transportation employees, steamship, barge, truck, railway, longshoremen, employees in brokerage firms, and the many hundreds of firms which supply the industry with essential items from insecticides and fertilizers to high-pressure steam boilers and harvesting and cultivating equipment.

The proposed bill would reenact with relatively minor changes the Sugar Act of 1948 which otherwise would terminate December 31, 1952. The allocation to the various producing areas on the mainland of the United States and to Hawaii remains the same as in the existing law. The major change in quotas is an increase in the allocation to Puerto Rico by 170,000 tons annually and to the Virgin Islands by 6,000 tons annually. It is my understanding that both of

these areas badly need this quota increase in order to maintain present-day economy and in some measure upgrade the standard of living in those areas.

The sugar industry of Louisiana is in complete accord with this proposed increase. The provisions of the bill were worked out in a series of conferences between producer and user groups in the sugar industry, and an interdepartmental committee composed of representatives of Departments of State, Interior, Commerce, Treasury, and Agriculture and the Tariff Commission. Many witnesses representing both Government and industry appeared before the committee during the several days' hearings on the bill which has been unanimously recommended by the committee for enactment.

Financially, I want to repeat, the sugar program is the only Government agricultural program which pays a dividend. From 1934 through the end of the fiscal year 1950, taxes collected as a part of the sugar program amounted to \$987,752,416, while all payments and administrative expenses of the Department of Agriculture in administering the program have totaled \$757,387,894, leaving an excess of taxes over expenditures, representing a net profit from the operations of the program, of \$230,364,522. Putting it on an annual basis, the average taxes collected are a little over \$76,000,000. Expenses, including administration and payments to growers, average about \$61,000,000 leaving a net annual profit of approximately \$16,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, in behalf of the consumers and producers of sugar in the State of Louisiana, I unhesitatingly recommend adoption of this proposed legislation which will bring to Louisiana for the next 4 years approximately \$70,000,000 annually and to the Treasurer of the United States approximately \$16,000,000 annually. Any legislation which puts dollars into private pockets and at the same time puts dollars into the Public Treasury is certainly worthy of passage by this body.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LARCADE].

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to join my colleague the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS], in thanking the chairman and members of the Committee on Agriculture of the House and Mr. Meyers, the head of the Sugar Branch of the Department of Agriculture for the consideration they have given this legislation. There is no opposition to the bill that I know of, and therefore, since the situation and provisions of the bill have been fully discussed, and because it is only a renewal of existing legislation, with minor amendments, I do not feel it is proper to take any time to discuss the legislation further, as I feel that the House will pass the bill unanimously.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to add however, that legislation in 1934 and this legislation since that time has saved a most important industry, not only in Louisiana, but in the other sugar-producing States of the mainland, as well as in our island possessions and other sugar-producing countries.

As an example, I well remember in 1933-34 when the sugar industry was about to be abandoned in Louisiana, the Delgado sugar plantation, near Jeanerette, La., with 3,300 acres of the finest sugar-producing land in Louisiana, together with a large sugar refinery worth nearly a half million dollars could have been purchased for \$75,000. I advised a relative of mine who was wealthy to buy this magnificent plantation with the refinery for the amount mentioned; however, he told me the sugar industry would never come back, and he did not take advantage of the opportunity.

Mr. Chairman, while it is true that some improvements have been made to the refinery, I am sure that the plantation and refinery could not be purchased today for at least \$2,000,000. That situation was true in all the sugar-producing States at that time, and I know that to be a fact as I was in the fire-insurance business at that time, and it was impossible to obtain one dollar of insurance on any sugar refinery anywhere. The insurance companies would not insure a sugar refinery for any amount.

Mr. Chairman, the extension of this legislation will continue to stabilize and protect the sugar industry throughout the world, and will also guarantee the consumer against any excessive price for a commodity that is a necessity to every household and many of our industries who are large users of sugar.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire, to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I am always glad to be able to support legislation which enables different segments of an industry to work together in harmony and mutual gain. I wish to congratulate the Committee on Agriculture for the careful work and thinking which has gone into this bill. I am also pleased to note that this program, in addition to securing a plentiful supply of sugar at reasonable and stable prices, operates at a gain for the Treasury or to the people at large.

Sugar is primarily a food or a preserving agent and is no longer considered to be a luxury, as thousands of housewives will testify by gleaming rows of home canned food. The extension and changes in this bill are but the continuance of an equitable system for the control of sugar production and consumption which began back in 1934 with the Jones-Costigan Act. The major premise of this legislation, a quota system with an excise equalizer in terms of production costs as between domestic and foreign producers, has stood since that time. Some modifications were necessary to meet the exigencies of the war, but we have been able to avoid the great surge in price which occurred in 1920 by smoothing out the production in various areas damaged by the war or areas called upon for great increases to meet increased demand. This bill re-establishes the quotas in force prior to the disruption of the war, with some gain to Puerto Rico and the Barbados Islands and a negligible cut for Cuba which will probably be wiped out by the increase in total consumption. It retains

the percentage allocated to domestic producers, including our insular areas, so that the historic industry may be maintained. It also continues the regulations concerning wages, the employment of minors, and working conditions generally. This program is a fine example of producer, industry, and government working for the common good. I heartily recommend the support of this bill.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CAMP].

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to know that in the renewal of this sugar legislation consideration has been given to the enlargement of the quota from Puerto Rico. In the hearings of the subcommittee of the Committee on Ways and Means in this island 2 years ago, we were very much impressed with the fact that although sugarcane is the principal crop of the island, under the restriction of the Sugar Act at that time, they were unable to plant to advantage a large proportion of their fertile soil in that crop, and although they had made many attempts to find other crops to grow they had not been successful in finding a profitable crop. Puerto Rico, as you know, is a very large island, and has perhaps the greatest density of population to be found anywhere in the world. I am delighted to know that the committee, under the renewal, has given the island some 170,000 additional tons in their quota. I commend the committee for it because I think it is certainly the proper thing to do. We sometimes forget that Puerto Rico is a part of our country, and that practically every person in the island now is a native-born American. I hope the committee will seriously consider the proposition of permitting a larger quantity of refined sugar to be shipped from Puerto Rico to the mainland. Of course, at the time the original Sugar Act was passed in 1934, they had very few refineries, and there have been no further refineries built there. But I feel sure that this is a subject which the committee can do well to further study. I wish to congratulate the committee for its action in this bill and for its splendid solution of the sugar problem.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, first permit me to express my appreciation to the Committee on Agriculture for the report of H. R. 4521 to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948. As has already been brought out here by many of my colleagues, this extension continues in force and effect the Sugar Act that has worked out satisfactory to all parties concerned. Prior to 1934, and for many years in the development of the sugar industry in the United States, it was in an unstable condition, but after 1934, as has been demonstrated, the people have been able to work out a fair and equitable manner and method of solving this problem.

Since the adoption of the original act in 1934 and the various amendments that have been added thereto, we have

been assured of a stable sugar supply throughout the United States. As this report accompanying H. R. 4521 amply demonstrates, there is a sufficient elasticity in the law to assure the consumers of the United States an adequate sugar supply.

In addition thereto, it has assured the industry of this country a fair and just return on their investment. Perhaps not in each instance does it work out fairly for everyone, but at the same time it gets us away from the chaos that existed prior to the time this act was first enacted in 1934. So we feel that the industry in this country has taken a great step and will continue to supply and bring to this Nation an adequate food supply in the form of sugar. I trust that each and all of you will join with us in the thought that this is good and needed legislation.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. FARRINGTON].

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, the prompt enactment of H. R. 4521 is important not only to all segments of the sugar industry but to the American consumer as well. It will insure an adequate supply of sugar at a reasonable price for at least another 5 years. This will embrace the period of the present emergency and for that reason is a step that is important to the present program of remobilization. The present law—the Sugar Act of 1948—expires on December 31, 1952. This bill would extend the law until December 31, 1956, with some amendments. Among the latter is an increase in the quota for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands and some of the so-called full duty countries. The changes in the law by and large do not alter the policy that prevails at the present time and represents more adjustments that have been necessary by the trend of the times in order that the policy be perpetuated. The quota allowed the Territory of Hawaii and other American producers remains the same.

We of Hawaii are strongly in favor of the prompt enactment of this bill in order that our production that is now reaching one of its highest peaks may continue with the assurance that the high standards achieved in our islands can be sustained and our product will find a ready market.

Sugar is an essential food. It finds its way into our diet in many indirect forms. Besides being used on the dining table to sweeten any number of dishes that are part of our daily diet, it is one of the essential ingredients of most soft drinks, candy, cookies, and cakes.

Close to 50 percent of the sugar used in this country is consumed by the so-called industrial users of sugar, who manufacture these products. Then, sugar is and always has been valuable as a preservative.

It may be said without fear of contradiction that this is a product that finds its way in one form or another into every grocery store, to nearly every food store and to all but a few homes in our country. The welfare of the industry is, therefore, of very great importance to the American consumer.



We have never produced in this country all of the sugar that we have consumed. Some sugar has always had to be imported. Most of it has come from tropical countries that are adapted to the production of cane sugar.

But at no time have we been completely dependent upon foreign countries for our sugar and at no time should we allow ourselves to fall into this position. Experience has shown only too well that when we become dependent for an essential product upon a foreign country we immediately invite higher prices and onerous restrictions. This is especially true when the products come from countries with absentee landlordism and without the restrictions against monopolistic practices that prevail in this country.

The most notorious experience of this kind was with raw rubber prior to World War II—a problem we have met by the production of synthetic rubber in what we like now to call the American rubber industry. The Sugar Act of 1943 aims to protect the consumer against just such an eventuality. It provides conditions under which production of sugar can be sustained in this country under standards that are consistent with the American way of life and, at the same time, makes it possible for an additional amount of sugar to be imported so as to insure the consumer an adequate supply at a reasonable price.

Without protection the American producers cannot survive the competition of other countries where most of the sugar of the world is produced. The principal reasons for this are the low standard of wages prevailing in these countries. Although national conditions for producing sugar in some of them may be considered more advantageous than in American producing areas, the fact remains that in none of them have the same high standards been achieved.

Long experience has amply demonstrated the soundness of this protection as a national policy. For many years the tariff served this purpose. But in the years following the depression in 1929 it failed and, in consequence, the present system of quotas was adopted in the Jones-Costigan Act of 1934. Without the safeguards of this law and those that have continued it, the production of sugar under the American flag could very readily have disappeared within a few years and the American consumer would be at the mercy of foreign producers whose standards of wages and working conditions are notoriously low.

The provision of the original law limiting the amount of sugar that can be refined in Hawaii to approximately the amount that is consumed in the Territory is still in the law and is as objectionable to us of Hawaii today as it was at the time of its adoption.

It is wrong in principle to deny a Territory that is an integral part of the country the right to market its product in the form it chooses. It is a residue of the old and now completely discredited colonial system under which the so-called mother country imported raw material from its colonies and reserved for itself the privilege of manufacturing this material into the finished product and

marketing it where it chose and usually in the same colonies from which the raw material was imported. But I do not propose to labor this point and desire only to record and reaffirm our position because the practical consequences of the present arrangement are not now serious from Hawaii's standpoint and there are other considerations of much greater importance.

The refinery in California, where most of Hawaii's sugar is refined, is owned by Hawaii's industry. The question of whether this sugar should be refined in Hawaii, where new refineries would have to be constructed for this purpose, instead of on the Pacific Coast in the industry's refinery is a lot less important than that the present system of quotas be continued. The discriminatory section with respect to refining sugar in Hawaii can very properly be dealt with at a later time.

Through a period of more than 16 years it has been possible under the provisions of the law now on the statute books to achieve in the sugar industry a balance between consumers and producers, domestic producers and foreign producers, and producers and refiners, that has served well to provide the American people with an adequate supply of sugar at a reasonable price and sustain production under the American flag at constantly improving standards.

For many years Hawaii has been one of the principal sources of sugar for this country. This relationship had its beginning 75 years ago when the United States concluded a commercial treaty of reciprocity with the Hawaiian monarchy. This was in 1876. The treaty permitted the importation of sugar produced in Hawaii free of duty and gave the United States coaling rights at Pearl Harbor. This was indeed a significant day in the history not only of Hawaii but of the United States as the events of the last 10 years have clearly demonstrated. From that day in 1876 when this treaty was concluded the relationship between Hawaii and the United States has become progressively closer.

In 1898 the Hawaiian Islands by voluntary annexation became an integral part of the United States. It is something of a coincidence that the American flag was first raised in Hawaii on August 12, 1898, exactly 53 years ago yesterday. That flag had only 45 stars. Oklahoma, Arizona, and New Mexico were still Territories. Hawaii became a Territory in 1900 by the adoption of the Hawaiian Organic Act that is still the law of Congress and under which we of the Territory are governed and under which we assume and have always met all of the financial obligations of a State and been subject to the same laws of the States.

During the period of the past 50 years, while we have been a Territory of the United States, the sugar industry has undergone great development. At the same time our life in Hawaii has become progressively more closely integrated with that of the rest of the country. Today our relationships with the rest of the country economically, culturally, and socially resembles those of a State in every respect but one. Politically, we are still a dependency with our partici-

pation in the National Government severely limited and will continue to be until we become a State. I hope that day is not far off.

The sugar industry remains today as it has for many years past the basis of Hawaii's economy. The interest of Hawaii in this legislation is therefore a very vital one. Hawaii is one of the principal American producers of sugar. Hawaii's quota under the present law is 1,052,000 tons. H. R. 4521 continues this quota. Hawaii will continue in the future under this law, as it has in the past, to produce about one-fourth of the sugar produced under the American flag.

I say without fear of contradiction and without undertaking to boast that the standards achieved in Hawaii in the production of sugar are the highest in the world.

More sugar is produced per acre with respect to the record per single acre and the average for the entire area than in any other sugar-producing area. This is shown by the table which follows:

Average tons of sugar per acre:	Tons
Hawaii.....	9
Louisiana.....	1.6
Florida.....	2.5
Puerto Rico.....	3.5
Beet area.....	2.1
Cuba.....	2.25

  

Average age of crop due to system is about:	Months
Hawaii.....	22
Louisiana.....	12
Florida.....	14
Puerto Rico.....	14
Cuba.....	14

Mechanization has brought the number of man-hours required to produce a ton of cane to the lowest point ever achieved anywhere. In other words, the volume of sugar produced by each individual sugar worker in Hawaii is greater than in any other place in the world.

And the wages paid to sugar workers in Hawaii are the highest in any place in the sugar industry.

These facts are graphically presented in charts prepared by the Sugar Branch of the Production and Marketing Administration of the Department of Agriculture.

The Hawaiian sugar industry has historically been a world leader in the development of new varieties of cane and better methods of agriculture. And now its scientists are turning their genius to mechanization. This has already reduced the manpower required to produce our sugar by more than one-half during a period of 1 year. The experimental work that has developed new varieties of cane, better methods of agriculture, and mechanization has been financed in full by the sugar industry itself, whose experiment station has won fame throughout the world for its findings. Hawaii's sugar industry is owned by the people of Hawaii—and they are American. With minor exceptions the industry has not suffered from the plague of absentee landlordism. Most of its principal owners are in Hawaii operating the industry themselves.

Production of sugar in Hawaii has been conducted on a corporate basis. It

is highly industrialized. This has brought great efficiency in production but it has also brought with it problems of industrial relationship that probably constitute the most serious problems that confront the industry today.

For many years organization of the workers in the sugar industry was resisted by management. The adoption of the Wagner Act brought about a great change in this respect. Representatives of the National Labor Board were active in encouraging the organization of labor and the more enlightened element of management accepted the principle of collective bargaining as the basis upon which future relationships should be conducted. The tide of this great change was stemmed by the outbreak of war on December 7, 1941. From that time until the end of the war, the people of Hawaii lived under the severest restriction and for the best part of the period under military government. But in the 5 years that have elapsed since the war the industry has been torn by bitter industrial strife. I introduce reference to this situation not only so that you may be informed of the present position of our industry but may realize how completely we feel the influence and the effect of Federal law. The people of the Territory, for better or worse, are controlled by the laws of Congress, although they are without the privilege of choosing those whose votes determine what these laws shall be and how they shall be administered.

I am sure everyone will agree that we are at least entitled under these conditions to the full protection and the full benefit of American law.

The standards that we have achieved are a source of great pride but they cannot be sustained without the maintenance of a policy of protection in the sugar industry.

We point with pride to the high wages that are paid to the sugar workers in our industry. We are glad that the conditions under which they are producing sugar are constantly being improved.

We hope that means will be found to raise the standard of wages in other producing areas and favor any steps that the Government can appropriately take to advance these wages and protect them from the competition of low foreign wages. This is the American system.

We feel that the administration of the Sugar Act of 1948 by the Department of Agriculture has been well informed, fair and efficient. Some criticism has been made of it by those who would have this agency pursue a more aggressive policy on the question of minimum wages but we recognize this represents an extremely difficult problem because of the great variation in the conditions controlling production and employment. The producers of beet sugar and cane sugar in the States probably never will achieve the production per acre that is possible in Hawaii because of different climatic conditions, and in Puerto Rico the introduction of mechanization and a compensating increase in wages would only serve to increase the very serious problem of unemployment. We nevertheless set the example and we hope

point the way and trust to the perpetuation of the protective system that makes the continuation of these high standards possible.

We believe our performance is in the best tradition of our country and ask that in the same tradition that we continue to enjoy the full protection of American law that is so important to our survival.

We therefore strongly urge the prompt enactment of this bill.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'Ewart].

Mr. D'Ewart. Mr. Chairman, first I would like to correct a question, which I addressed to the chairman of the committee in regard to wool. I am informed, since I addressed that question to him, that I was in error. There was a loss in the wool program when the warehousing and all the rest of the charges are considered.

Mr. Chairman, sugar beets are one of the big crops in my State. We have five large factories, four in my district. The debate today has brought out that the beet industry is not quite as healthy as some of the talks which have been made this afternoon would seem to indicate. The acreage planted in the United States in beets is down 26 percent. That indicates that there is something wrong, perhaps temporarily, but nevertheless something wrong with the beet industry. It is the established policy, as is brought out in the report, to keep a sound sugar industry in the United States and to preserve the ability of this Nation to produce a portion of this vital product needed by the American consumers. I think that is a sound policy. But with beet acreage down 26 percent in this country, my mail indicates that that policy is not being carried out, at least this year, 100 percent. There are several reasons for that. One of them is the increase of prices of other agricultural commodities. I have here the average prices received by farmers for crops produced in my State in May 1941 and May 1951:

*Average prices received by Montana farmers as reported by Bureau of Agricultural Economics*

	May 1941	May 1951	Percentage 1951 as of 1941
Corn.....bushel..	\$0.65	\$1.75	269
Wheat.....do....	.68	1.96	288
Barley.....do....	.41	.99	241
Oats.....do....	.32	.70	219
Potatoes.....do....	.50	1.20	240
Beans.....hundredweight..	3.25	6.50	200
Alfalfa:			
Loose.....ton....	5.90	19.70	334
Baled.....do....	8.30	26.60	320
Cattle.....hundredweight..	8.20	29.20	356
Hogs.....do....	8.30	21.50	259
Lambs.....do....	8.70	31.50	362
Wool.....pound..	.34	1.15	338
Beets.....ton....	18.71	23.26	152

<sup>1</sup> Final on 1941 crop. Includes \$1.94 Sugar Act payments.

<sup>2</sup> 1950 crop. Includes approximate additional payment and Sugar Act payment of \$2.46.

Wheat is up 288 percent. Barley is up 241 percent, alfalfa 334 percent, wool 338 percent while beets are up 152 percent. That indicates that the relative price for beets is not in conformity

with other agricultural products, which doubtless is one of the reasons that the acreage of beets has decreased.

I have here another statement showing the average rise in price of retail sugar, between 1933 and 1950, from 5.3 cents to 9.7 cents which means an increase of 84 percent. The rise in prices of all food products is 143 percent. Certainly, that is another reason for the switch from beets, a commodity which we want to keep in healthy production in this country. The rise in sugar has been 84 percent. The rise in cane has been 170 percent. The average prices of field labor are up 393 percent in the domestic sugar production area, a situation which makes the production of sugar beets in the West, not as profitable as it formerly was.

I am not speaking here today to ask that the price of beets be raised out of proportion to other food and commodity prices, but I do think the time has come, if we are to have the acreage of this commodity that we need in the country, we must give some consideration to these growers so as to give them a relative price which will make them able to compete with other commodities.

Another reason I would like to bring to the attention of the Congress is that one of the principal products of our irrigated areas of the West is beets. If beets are not in a healthy position, it is going to be difficult for irrigated farms to return the cost and investment of the Federal Government in those irrigated farms.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. D'Ewart. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. For the sake of argument, let us assume that the same conditions continue to prevail which have so influenced the acreage of sugar beets in the current year and that next year, 1952, the beet acreage again drops 25 or 30 percent. Assuming that, what will be the ultimate effect on the sugar supply for the people of the United States as related to price, under a proposal of this kind? Of course, the answer to that question would be that Cuba picks up control of the supply of sugar for our people, and Cuba being a foreign country can set her price.

Mr. D'Ewart. That is right, and the domestic sugar industry and the irrigated areas of our country will be hurt.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Montana has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Chenoweth].

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the Committee on Agriculture for its fine work on this bill, which should have the support of every Member of this House. I have heard of no opposition to this extension of the Sugar Act.

I wish to say a word in behalf of the beet-sugar industry. I can recall a time when the importance of the beet-sugar industry to the welfare of our country was not recognized as it is today. I remember that when I first came to Congress 10 years ago an order had just been issued reducing the sugar-beet acreage



for that year. Within a couple of years we were short of sugar because of the war, and were dependent upon domestic producers, both cane and beet, for our sugar supply. Then we began to realize what the beet-sugar industry really meant to this country. I am in favor of doing everything possible to increase our domestic production of sugar so that we can be prepared for any emergency.

There was a time not so long ago when certain high Government officials in this country were contending that the beet-sugar industry was not an economical operation and should be liquidated. I think this theory has now been completely repudiated. I do not hear these expressions anymore. The fact that this bill extending the Sugar Act for another 4 years is before the House today without any opposition is convincing proof of the importance of our domestic beet-sugar industry is now recognized by everyone.

Up until recently Colorado has led in the production of sugar beets, with more plants for the processing of sugar beets than any other State. Colorado has always taken the lead in promoting the production of domestic sugar.

We take great pride in Colorado in the fact that we have championed the beet-sugar industry. In Colorado we have the main offices of some of the largest beet-sugar companies in this country. We have always been looked upon as the beet-sugar center of the United States. For this reason this bill today is of tremendous importance to my State.

I am happy to join with my colleagues from Colorado, and the Members of this House, in extending the Sugar Act for another 4 years. This act has meant much, not only for the sugar industry, but also for the general economy of this Nation. It has been called to your attention by my colleague from Colorado [Mr. HILL] that sugar, during World War I, reached a price of \$33 per hundred. Sugar has remained, both during and since World War II, as one of the cheapest of our staple commodities. I think that is largely due to the fact that we have had this Sugar Act, which has made it possible for all segments of the sugar industry to cooperate with each other.

We have the happy situation today where all branches of the sugar industry have agreed to this extension. Everyone concedes that this legislation is most vital to our economy. Representing a district where sugar beets are grown and processed, I am indeed happy to support the pending bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. In order to report out the bill presently before us it was necessary for the committee to get in agreement with the Interior Department, the Commerce Department, I believe the Treasury Department, Agriculture Department, the Tariff Commission, also with the farmers, processors, and those handling and connected with sugar production. They must have done a pretty good job, because there does

not seem to be any opposition to the legislation; and for that I would compliment the committee. I will support the measure.

I have in my district at Grand Island, Nebr., one of the oldest sugar factories in the United States, and it is still operating. There is an unfortunate incident, though, attached to the sugar industry in western Nebraska in that there are two or three factories that have ceased to operate. You may ask why that happened? I think part of it is due to the fact that regulations by the Government have gradually reduced the acreage of sugar beets. The sugar-beet companies will tell you that they do not have the acreage to warrant keeping the factories open, and I know that many farmers, small farmers—and I own an irrigated farm in western Nebraska—they have quit. My man says, "I do not want to raise sugar beets any more." He finds it is more profitable to raise alfalfa, bale it, and sell it, with less labor troubles and the weather conditions that exist. Then, too, the price of sugar from a calorie standpoint is much lower than other commodities that you now buy. The cost of sugar—oh, it could well be one, two, dollars more than it is at the present time to be in line with the other commodities that the consumer uses. So I think the regulations, and the labor conditions, and the whole group of things have seriously upset the economy in some of these areas, enough so that sugar factories have closed.

There is another thing that comes out of the raising of sugar beets; it is the pulp. I do not know whether it has been mentioned here but the farmers who raised beets in the past always used the pulp to put into the cow. That makes good feed. Beet pulp plus feeding produced fertilizer which the land needs. Instead of raising beets some of these farmers have gone to raising beans, they have gone to raising potatoes, because it is less work; they have made more money with beans and potatoes. You cannot blame the farmer for that, but it has done something to the farm; there is less fertilization and there is no pulp, so the soil fertility is going down. I am hoping that the time will come and come soon in this country when we will set our foot down and say to these great Departments, Interior, Treasury, the Tariff Commission, and so on, that we are going to raise in the United States all the sugar we can raise. We are 26 percent below what we could raise.

Another factor to take into consideration is the changed eating habits of the American people. The eating of the American people has changed. I checked with the Agriculture Department not long ago. Forty years ago they were eating 204 pounds of potatoes—Maine would be interested in this—today they eat 111 pounds of potatoes because somebody said potatoes made you fat, and the women and others quit eating potatoes. Then in the matter of apples, 40 years ago we were eating 55½ pounds of apples per person; today we are eating 38.8 pounds per person. Dairy products, 338 pounds 40 years ago; today the consumption is better than 429 pounds with the exception of butter. You but-

ter people had better ask the oleo people why butter consumption has not increased. In the matter of citrus fruit it has doubled or trebled because 40 years ago they did not have much citrus fruit. Sugar: I believe 40 years ago the consumption was 84 pounds per person; last year it was 106. Coffee, tea, and cocoa have increased from 10 to 19 pounds. And do you know how much food the American has been eating for all these 40 years? One thousand five hundred and seventy-six pounds of food every year.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. I would just like to say that certainly the sugar program has not resulted in forcing the beet producers in the gentleman's territory out of business; actually our information was to the effect that the beet producers have not been able to reach the quota which they have been allotted, and there has been a deficit in the beet area.

I think in the beet area they did not meet the quota, whereas in the sugar-cane areas they just about reached the quota.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I think that is true, but a great many farmers have gone out of the sugar-beet business because the support price on beans and potatoes made that crop more attractive.

Mr. COOLEY. I think the gentleman is correct.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. A few years ago a man named Henry Wallace came out to Scottsbluff, Nebr., and made the statement before a large number of farmers that they should not be raising beets in that part of the country, that they ought to get their sugar from Puerto Rico and Cuba. The next morning there was a life-sized picture of Mr. Wallace hanging to a tree, with appropriate remarks under it. The farmers did not like the idea that the raising of sugar beets was not for them.

There are other things in this beet picture. I hope that we do not give away our quotas and that it will be possible for new irrigated areas to get a quota to raise beets. Our farmers should be encouraged to raise a full quota.

I would ask that the committee give special attention to not only the price of sugar, because I think it should be raised, but to encouraging farmers to raise sugar beets instead of beans and potatoes, because I know sugar beets are much better for irrigated land. They should not continually just skim off the best soil in raising other crops than beets. I shall vote for this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has again expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I would like to know if under this bill if I owned 100

acres of land I can plant anything I want on it?

Mr. CRAWFORD. You can plant?

Mr. NICHOLSON. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. There is nothing in this bill that restricts the production of sugar. I did not say "the marketing of sugar." I said, "the production of sugar." This is a marketing bill, a marketing quota bill.

I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] if there is any provision in this bill which gives the Secretary of Agriculture the direct authority to set the price on sugar?

Mr. COOLEY. No; there is nothing in the bill that gives him that authority.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I agree with the chairman of the Agricultural Committee in that statement. That is what I wanted to emphasize. Here is a program which seems to be absolutely satisfactory to everybody concerned. Perhaps I should say substantially satisfactory to most everybody concerned. It works, and we do not have to give a Government bureau the right to set the price. It has worked for years and there is no direct price-fixing scheme in the whole proposition. If you were to take a vote of the housewives of this country I think they would tell you that sugar is as reasonable in price as anything which they purchase with which to feed the family to date. So there is something else to keep in mind in dealing with this bill.

The committee report points out one or two other rather significant things.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. D'EWART. I would like to quote from the bill:

By providing such supply of sugar as will be consumed at a price which will not be excessive.

Is that not price fixing?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I said, "direct price control," and I still stick to that after the gentleman has read that statement.

What fixes prices? Why, supply, the desire of a seller to dispose of his goods. You can get in an economic squeeze. The banker may call in your loan. You might sell beef cattle at 15 cents per hundred under the market price if you had to raise money, because you could not ship them to market. You will have to raise money or else lose your herd. When the Secretary of Agriculture operates the amount of sugar which can be sold in the United States in such a way as to bring about a balance between supply and demand, naturally that fixes the price of the product in any man's market; but there is no direct price fixing. Show me where the Secretary of Agriculture has issued an order to the producers at what price they should sell their sugar during the last several months, while this law has been in operation. Well, of course, you cannot produce the order. That is what I am emphasizing.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. He does it indirectly. You are given a quota and if you go over that quota you cannot sell

sugar. He has a fixed price and determines how much is to be consumed, so he has the formula, and by having the formula, indirectly he sets the price of sugar.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do not know whether I would agree with that completely. He may have a formula. Suppose the farmers in your district decide that they do not want to grow any sugar-cane or sugar beets. What are you going to do about that proposition? Suppose the farmers in Louisiana, Texas, and all the 16 sugar-beet-growing States decide they will not grow any more sugar, then they have nothing to sell and they have to do something else, through the co-operation of some other country.

The committee report says:

Sugar is an essential food product, and it has long been the established policy of the United States Government—for defense and strategic reasons—

And if I had been writing that report I would have put in another item there, "for defense and strategic reasons and the protection of the pocketbooks of the housewives of this country in their purchase of sugar."

The report goes on—

to preserve within the United States the ability to produce at least a portion of this vital food product needed by American consumers.

And, I would not have used the language "at least a portion"; I would have used language "at least a very substantial portion."

Now, why do I say that? Going to page 4 of the bill it shows that the domestic sugar industry, operating under the American flag, as our distinguished chairman the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] has pointed out, can, under this bill, place in the market 54.08 percent of the sugar marketed in this country. That is correct, is it not, may I ask the distinguished gentleman?

Mr. COOLEY. That is right.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And there is a substantial portion. There is the security for the housewives of this country, the fact that you give the domestic producers—and who are they? The American citizens in Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, the United States beet and the United States cane areas—the right under the sugar marketing quota to sell into this market over 54 percent of whatever determination the Secretary of Agriculture says may be sold. There is your protection. Suppose the inflationary forces continue to work. Suppose the war operations become much heavier and millions of our men are pulled away from farm and industry to fight wars until such a situation develops where the sugar growers of this country cannot produce sugar, then what is your situation? Then may I say to my friends who so often speak substantially in the interest of organized labor—which is certainly all right and I have no objection to that—you become dependent upon the low-paid, semislave labor of Cuba and other hot countries for the sugar that comes into this country. But, you will have no power to control the price of that sugar coming in. The

foreign producer under the foreign flag, where his own Government is sovereign, can sell that sugar to your housewives as they did following World War I—not during World War I, following World War I—at as high as 23½ cents per pound raw value, which means 35 cents per pound refined value at the retail stores. This occurred then because Cuba was in control of the market. It can occur again if we let our domestic production fall to a very low level.

That is why your Government should always protect our domestic consumers in having produced a very substantial percentage of whatever sugar is consumed, in this country, so as to make you independent of the avariciousness of the producer in the foreign country who produces his sugar at these low, sweat-labor costs and sells it at a high price because he can control the market in the United States by reason of the absence of domestic production of sugar under the American flag.

Mr. Chairman, those are the points I wish to emphasize here. Of course this bill is here in the interest of the consumers of sugar, in the interest of those who work in the sugar cane fields and in the beet fields in all of these domestic areas, and in the interest of those who have invested their savings in the machinery, the buildings, and the tools which are used by the factory workers to process and refine the sugar grown in the areas covered by this bill.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico [Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN].

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. Mr. Chairman, H. R. 4521, to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948, has the full endorsement of the people of Puerto Rico.

Sugar is the backbone of the Puerto Rican economy. Puerto Rico is a small subtropical island of 3,500 square miles. It is an American Territory. It lives within the tariff system of the United States. It buys and sells almost exclusively in the United States. Puerto Rico is as much a member of the United States economic system as Rhode Island, New York, or California.

Nature's laws make us dependent upon the agricultural products of our soil for our livelihood. Our position within the economic system of the United States requires us to concentrate on such products of a tropical soil as meet the demand of the United States domestic market of which we are a part.

Thus, we must devote our energies to sugar, which the climate permits us to produce; which the people of the United States consume and do not produce in quantities large enough to satisfy domestic consumption.

Since 1934, Congress has found it necessary to enact legislation to stabilize the sugar market, to protect domestic producers, so that they may be able to continue to produce, and consumers to the end that there may be an adequate supply of sugar at fair prices.

When the 1948 Sugar Act was enacted, Puerto Rico was not given a marketing quota sufficient to take care of its production. This hit us in the Achilles heel of our economy: 1948, 1949, 1950, and 1951 have been years of anguish for



Puerto Rico. We have been faced with a sugar surplus above quota with no ready market for it.

I must express sincere appreciation for the able way that the Sugar Branch of the Department of Agriculture has aided Puerto Rico over this difficult period. They have extended themselves to the utmost to find ways to help us. Now when the 1948 law is to be continued, the administration, after careful study and consideration of all factors concerned, has recommended an increase in Puerto Rico's quota. It does not take care of Puerto Rico's full production, but it certainly helps, and it will give the island's people a greater sense of security as to their economic future. Puerto Rico is grateful to the Committee on Agriculture for its unanimous recommendation for this increase as embodied in the bill.

Still, there is an aspect of the 1948 Sugar Act that stems from the original sugar legislation of 1934, which under H. R. 4521 will be extended for 4 more years, and which we consider to be eminently unfair to Puerto Rico. I refer to a quantitative restriction imposed on trade between Puerto Rico and the mainland. Under the Sugar Act, Puerto Rico is not permitted to market its quota sugar in the mainland as refined sugar, except in fractional amount. This violates the principle of free trade, as it exists in interstate commerce, and has been intended to exist between Puerto Rico and the mainland, since Puerto Rico was first organized under law of Congress in 1900. Since 1900 Puerto Rico has been incorporated into the tariff system of the United States. This should call for unhampered trade with the mainland. Being within the tariff system we are practically cut off from foreign trade. Under the refined-sugar restriction we are also curtailed in our free trade within the economic system of the United States.

Puerto Rico has 2,200,000 inhabitants. Ours is one of the most densely populated areas in the world. There are more than 600 persons per square mile. We cannot live on agriculture alone. We must industrialize in order to survive. No industry is more natural to us than the refinement of our own sugar which in turn is our main product. Yet we are prevented from doing this by Federal law.

H. R. 4521 does not alter the provision limiting the refining of sugar in Puerto Rico first established in 1934 as a temporary measure. The limitation is now stretched four more years up to 1956. Thus, for 22 years, Puerto Rico will have been prevented from developing its refining industry and is forced to operate only 50 percent of its capacity.

The Committee on Agriculture very generously and in the spirit of justice, for which I wish to express my thanks, calls attention to this situation on page 14 of the report. I quote from the report:

The bill increases the quota for Puerto Rico from 910,000 tons annually under the 1948 act, to 1,080,000 tons. In addition, Puerto Rico produces and refines its own sugar for domestic consumption, currently about 110,000 tons per year. While the in-

crease of 170,000 tons in the Puerto Rico quota will not absorb the entire sugar production of which the island is capable in good crop years, it is believed that it will substantially improve the situation of producers in Puerto Rico.

The committee was asked to consider an increase in the amount of refined sugar which can be shipped to the mainland from Puerto Rico as part of its quota. At the present time, Puerto Rico is limited to shipment of 126,000 tons of refined sugar to the mainland. It refines, of course, that sugar which is used domestically, but the total of approximately 236,000 tons which is now refined in Puerto Rico, is only about one-half the refining capacity presently available on the island. Puerto Rico's quota of refined sugar has not been increased since the establishment of sugar quotas in 1934, and no change is made in the refined-sugar quotas in this bill. The committee feels that some adjustment might well be considered in the proportion of the Puerto Rico quota which can be refined on the island, but it felt that this question is a matter distinctly separate from the assignment of over-all production quotas, with which this bill is concerned, and it believes that this matter should be taken up separately and at another time.

These words carry new hope for the people of Puerto Rico, a hope we expect to bear fruit in the near future. With this new hope, and, despite the fact that H. R. 4521 does not entirely meet our expectations, or solve this important problem of sugar refining, I say again that the people of Puerto Rico endorse the bill. We believe it an important step in the right direction and we pray that it be adopted.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 202 of the Sugar Act of 1948 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 202. Whenever a determination is made, pursuant to section 201, of the amount of sugar needed to meet the requirements of consumers, the Secretary shall establish quotas, or revise existing quotas (a) for—

"Domestic sugar-producing areas, by apportioning among such areas 4,444,000 short tons, raw value, as follows:

"Area	Short tons, raw value
Domestic beet sugar.....	1,800,000
Mainland cane sugar.....	500,000
Hawaii.....	1,052,000
Puerto Rico.....	1,080,000
Virgin Islands.....	12,000

"(b) For the Republic of the Philippines, in the amount of 952,000 short tons of sugar as specified in section 211 of the Philippine Trade Act of 1946.

"(c) For foreign countries other than the Republic of the Philippines, by prorating among such countries an amount of sugar, raw value, equal to the amount determined pursuant to section 201 less the sum of the quotas established pursuant to subsections (a) and (b) of this section, on the following basis:

"Area	Percent
Cuba.....	96
Foreign countries other than Cuba and the Republic of the Philippines.....	4

"Ninety-five percent of the quota for foreign countries other than Cuba and the Republic of the Philippines shall be prorated among such countries on the basis of the average amount imported from each such country within the quotas established for the years 1948, 1949, and 1950, except that a

separate proration need not be established for any country which entered less than 2 percent of the average importations within the quotas for such years. The amount of the quota not so prorated may be filled by countries not receiving separate prorations, but no such country shall enter an amount pursuant to this subsection in excess of 1 percent of the quota for foreign countries other than Cuba and the Republic of the Philippines.

"(d) Notwithstanding the other provisions of this title II, the minimum quota established for Cuba, including increases resulting from deficits determined pursuant to section 204 (a), shall not be less than the following:

"(1) Twenty-eight and six-tenths percent of the amount of sugar determined under section 201 when such amount is 7,400,000 short tons or less; and

"(2) Two million one hundred and sixteen thousand short tons, when the amount of sugar determined under section 201 is more than 7,400,000 short tons.

"The quotas for domestic sugar-producing areas, established pursuant to the other provisions of this title II, shall be reduced pro rata by such amounts as may be required to establish such minimum quota for Cuba."

Committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, after the word "existing", strike out "quotas (a) for" and insert "quotas—  
"(a) For."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, after line 12, strike out the word "Area" and insert "Country."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. Section 204 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 204. (a) The Secretary shall from time to time determine whether, in view of the current inventories of sugar, the estimated production from the acreage of sugarcane or sugar beets planted, the normal marketings within a calendar year of new-crop sugar, and other pertinent factors, any area will be unable to market the quota for such area. If the Secretary finds that any domestic area or Cuba will be unable to market the quota for such area, he shall revise the quotas for the domestic areas and Cuba by prorating an amount of sugar equal to the deficit so determined to the other such areas on the basis of the quotas then in effect. If the Secretary finds that the Republic of the Philippines will be unable to market the quota for such area, he shall revise the quotas for Cuba and foreign countries other than Cuba and the Republic of the Philippines by prorating an amount of sugar equal to the deficit so determined, as follows:

"To Cuba, 96 percent; and

"To foreign countries other than Cuba and the Republic of the Philippines, 4 percent.

If the Secretary finds that foreign countries other than Cuba and the Republic of the Philippines cannot fill the quota for such area, he shall increase the quota for Cuba by an amount equal to the deficit.

"Whenever the Secretary finds that any area will be unable to fill its proration of any such deficit, he may apportion such unfilled amount on such basis and to such areas as he determines is required to fill such deficit.

"(b) Whenever the Secretary finds that any country will be unable to fill the proration to such country of the quota for foreign countries other than Cuba and the Republic

of the Philippines established under section 202 (c), or that any part of such proration has not been filled on September 1 of the calendar year, he may apportion such unfilled amount on such basis and to such countries as he determines is required to fill such proration.

"(c) The quota or applicable proration for any domestic area, the Republic of the Philippines, Cuba, or other foreign countries as established under the provisions of section 202 shall not be reduced by reason of any determination of a deficit existing in any calendar year under the provisions of subsections (a) and (b) of this section."

SEC. 3. Section 207 of such act is amended by adding a new subsection (h) as follows:

"(h) The quota for foreign countries other than Cuba and the Republic of the Philippines may be filled by direct-consumption sugar only to the extent of 1.36 percent of the amount of sugar determined pursuant to section 201 less the sum of the quotas established in subsections (a) and (b) of section 202: *Provided*, That each such country shall be permitted to enter an amount of direct-consumption sugar not less than the average amount entered by it during the years 1948, 1949, and 1950."

#### Committee amendment:

Page 5, line 3, insert:

"SEC. 4. Section 208 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 208. Quotas for liquid sugar for foreign countries for each calendar year are hereby established as follows:

"In terms of wine  
gallons of 72 percent  
total sugar content

"Country:

"Cuba .....	7,970,558
Dominican Republic.....	830,894
British West Indies .....	300,000
Other foreign countries....	0"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture knows, I am very much interested in this section of the bill in behalf of an importer of molasses in my district, who imports in small quantities from the British West Indies and Barbados. As is stated in the committee report, these importations presented a problem due to the fact that it is impracticable, for technical reasons—or at least very difficult—to have importations of molasses comply with the existing law as to soluble nonsugar solids. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture gave very fair consideration to this problem as it affects my constituent and other importers of molasses. I am not at all sure that this is the best possible solution under all the circumstances, but it is certainly a fair recognition of the problem and a fair effort to deal with it, and I wish to express my personal gratitude to the committee.

I would like to inquire of the chairman of the committee whether the reference to quotas for the British West Indies is not in fact almost entirely taken up by importations from Barbados.

Mr. COOLEY. I think that is correct. It is meant almost entirely for Barbados molasses.

Mr. HALE. I think the British West Indies would not include British Guiana. I do not know whether there are any importations from British Guiana. Perhaps the gentleman can inform me

whether that was any factor in the consideration.

Mr. COOLEY. I think our information was to the effect that this entire provision would be for Barbados molasses.

Mr. HALE. I am very grateful to the chairman and to the committee for their consideration. I think this provision of the bill is a salutary one.

I yield back the remainder of my time, Mr. Chairman.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. Section 411 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 411. The powers vested in the Secretary under this Act shall terminate on December 31, 1956, except that the Secretary shall have power to make payments under title III under programs applicable to the crop year 1956 and previous crop years."

Committee amendment: Page 6, line 7, strike out "4" and insert "5."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 5. Section 3508 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to termination of taxes) is amended by striking out "June 30, 1953" wherever appearing therein and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1957".

Committee amendment: Page 6, line 14, strike out "5" and insert "6."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 6. The amendments herein shall become effective January 1, 1953, except that sections 1 through 3 hereof shall be effective for purposes of the determinations and regulations required for the calendar year 1953.

Committee amendment: Page 6, line 18, strike out "6" and insert "7."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is made necessary because the Printing Office failed to include one amendment which was adopted by the Committee.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. COOLEY: page 6, line 18, strike out the figure "3" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "4."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time merely for the purpose of complimenting and paying a brief tribute to the Administrator who has so well, effectively, and satisfactorily administered this sugar program. I have served on the Committee on Agriculture for many years, and I am frank to say that Mr. Lawrence Myers presented one of the most comprehensive statements when he appeared before our committee that it has been my pleasure ever to hear in that committee. He has demonstrated an impartial and fair attitude at all times and has administered the law in accordance with both its letter and its spirit.

I think it is due largely to Mr. Myers' efforts that all of the departments of the Government and all branches of the industry have been brought together in almost complete accord with regard to the problems involved. As I recall when I first came to Congress the sugar indus-

try was in almost a state of chaos; you could hardly get one sugar man to speak to another; now they all seem to be as sweet as sugar and everything is going well. I think it is due largely to the magnificent manner in which Mr. Myers has administered the law.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. I simply want to join with my distinguished chairman in the tribute he has paid to Mr. Myers and the splendid way in which Mr. Myers has administered the present Sugar Act. I am sure that every member of the committee was well impressed with Mr. Myers' statement which was one of the finest, I think, that was ever made before our committee by any Government official.

Mr. COOLEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRESTON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4521) to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948, and for other purposes, directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### AMENDMENT OF BANKHEAD-JONES FARM TENANT ACT

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 684) to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act so as to provide a more effective distribution of mortgage loans insured under title I, to give holders of such mortgage loans preference in the refinancing of loans on a noninsured basis, to adjust the loan limitations governing title II loans so as to provide more effective assistance to production- and subsistence-loan borrowers, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not, will the gentleman from North Carolina kindly explain the provisions of the bill?

Mr. COOLEY. I shall be very glad to yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] for that purpose, and further to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES]. These two gentlemen were



the authors of two bills which our committee considered.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the House passed a similar bill to this, H. R. 7268, last year. It was known as the Pace bill. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES] and myself, introduced bills identical to the Pace bill this year. These were H. R. 2642 and H. R. 4077. The principal difference between our bills and S. 684 is that S. 684 did not increase the present mortgage lending authority of \$100,000,000 but left it exactly where it is in existing law. Mr. JONES' bill and mine would have increased this authority to \$200,000,000.

#### ANALYSIS OF S. 684

The words "and insuring mortgages" and "insured mortgages or" in lines 6 and 7 of page 1 are stricken out so that the formulas regarding direct loans and insured loans will be different. Lines 3 to 11, page 2, sets up a new formula in the case of insured loans.

Under the present law, both direct and insured loans are made with reference to farm population and prevalence of tenancy in the various States. With this amendment, direct loans will continue to be made on this basis. With respect to insured loans, however, one-quarter or \$25,000,000 of present \$100,000,000 insurance authority will be distributed to the various States and Territories based on applications and without regard to the farm population or prevalence of tenancy formula. This change in the law is necessary in order to enable some of the Western States where farm tenancy population ratio is low, to take advantage of the act.

Section 2: Section 2 relates to operating loans and makes four changes in the present law.

First. It raises the limit on the amount of initial operating loans from \$3,500 to \$7,000.

Second. It raises the debt limit for such loans from \$5,000 to \$10,000.

Third. It raises the maximum repayment period from 5 to 7 years.

Fourth. It raises from 5 to 7 years the period during which a borrower may be continually indebted for operating loans and still be eligible for additional financial assistance.

The need for increasing initial operating loans and debt limits on such loans are related directly to the changed agricultural situation. The prices farmers have to pay for items used in their operations have increased sharply in recent years. At the present time, \$5,900 is required to purchase the same amount of machinery and livestock as could be purchased in 1946 for \$3,500. Additional amounts are further needed because of the increased tendency to mechanize and to use fertilizer and soil-improvement practices.

The time limit is raised from 5 to 7 years because experience has shown that 5 years are not sufficient time for many family-type farmers to make and pay for needed major adjustments in their farming operations. This has been brought out by studies made by the North Carolina Agricultural Experiment Station and by the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis.

Section 3: Section 3 of the bill provides that in the case of insured mortgage loans, the Secretary may at his discretion delay his request for financing until the borrower has acquired a sufficient equity in the farm to enable the holder of the insured mortgage to refinance the loan on an uninsured basis under the laws or regulations to which he may be subject.

The reason for this provision is that many lenders do not have legal authority to make conventional loans unless the equity is greater than the present law requires for refinancing. This gives such lenders a chance to carry the loan after its insured features have lapsed. Where lenders are unwilling to do so, the borrower will still be required to refinance a loan with any other responsible credit source available.

Section 4: Section 4 allows discretionary authority to defer the initial payment for real estate or operating loans at a date not exceeding two full crop years from the date of the loan, if the Secretary determines that farm income sufficient to make the initial payment cannot readily be anticipated at an earlier date.

This provision is necessary, particularly when loans are made involving substantial land development or the conversion of a farm operation to a substantially different type. In such cases, yields are delayed generally until livestock matures or pastures have become productive or land development is completed. Under such circumstances it is unrealistic to require repayment within a period of 1 year.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to impose on the time of the House by commenting on the pending measure especially after the very fine analysis made by the coauthor the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], who has just preceded me. However, I would like to emphasize the most salient points that were brought to your attention by my distinguished colleague.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to preface my remarks on this pending measure by giving an account of the history of this legislation. Most of us no doubt recall that year before last, during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, we passed an almost identical bill authored by Mr. Pace and myself which failed to be adopted in the Senate. This year the Senate has adopted S. 684 which is almost identical with the pending legislation in the House of which the gentleman from Oklahoma, Congressman ALBERT, and I are coauthors.

The distinguished Agriculture Committee has gone into this measure most thoroughly and has reported the bill unanimously. I wish to commend this excellent committee for the very thorough and punctual consideration that attended their deliberation on this measure.

Undoubtedly, the most urgent features of this bill are those provisions which amend title II of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act dealing with so-called production and subsistence-operating loans. Provision is made to increase the limitation on the amount of an initial operating loan from \$3,500 to \$7,000 and

to increase from \$5,000 to \$10,000 the total debt limit for such loans. Provision is also made to raise from 5 to 7 years the period during which operating loans must be repaid, and extend from 5 to 7 years the period beyond which borrowers who are continuously indebted for loans may be eligible for additional financial assistance.

There are two primary reasons why the limitations on the size and the total amount of operating loans need to be increased:

First, modern farming requires more extensive use of credit than in any previous period of our history. To achieve greater efficiency and security in the operation of family-type farms usually involves additional mechanization, increased use of fertilizer, additional investments in soil improvement, fencing, and livestock.

According to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics studies, the total average investment, but not necessarily the amount of credit needed, for farm machinery and productive livestock on family-operated farms in four major types of farming areas during 1949 were as follows: \$8,941 for Wisconsin dairy farms; \$7,921 for wheat, corn, and livestock farms in the Northern Plains; \$7,487 for hog, corn, and beef cattle farms in the Corn Belt; and \$6,800 for combination cotton and dairy farms in the South. These figures represent the average investments, based on actual farm inventory values, for livestock and machinery on typical family-operated farms. They do not include annual operating capital needed for carrying out the farming operations. Since these figures represent averages for the farmers included in each group, they do not reflect the increased capital investments that would be required by farmers who have limited resources with which to start farming. Under the present loan limitations, it is necessary in many areas to limit operating credit assistance under this program to only those applicants who have acquired considerable equity in machinery and livestock. Many established farmers need to change from a single cash crop system to a diversified system in order to increase their incomes to produce a satisfactory living for their families, meet operating expenses, fixed overhead costs, repay loans, and maintain or improve the fertility of the soil. For many of these family-type farm operators to undertake successfully a sound, well-balanced farming operation, credit in excess of the present limitations is required.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to state that the gentleman from Alabama, who is now addressing the House, introduced H. R. 2642, which was the first bill introduced in this Congress on this subject.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I appreciate the statement made by the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma concerning this bill. As coauthor of this measure I can assure the Members of the House that it has been a rare privilege indeed

to have worked with him in the preparation and presentation of the bill to the committee and to the House. No one has shown a keener insight into the problems of agriculture nor has there been a more zealous advocate for rural America than my friend and colleague the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

The second reason why the limitations on the size and total amount of operating loans need to be increased is because prices which farmers have to pay for the items used in their operations have increased sharply in recent years and it is absolutely necessary to have more cash or credit to meet operating costs. For example, a farmer who would have required a \$3,500 loan in 1946 for annual operating expenses and the purchase of machinery and livestock would have required a loan of approximately \$5,900 for the same purposes in March 1951. This represents an increase of 61 percent. Large numbers of family-type operators are finding it impossible to obtain credit in adequate amounts for making needed improvements. They are forced to continue farming under a system which precluded the use of improved practices and the possibility of increased production and income which would be derived therefrom. Because of the increases in costs and the limitations on the size and total amount of operating loans which can be advanced under present authorities, it is impossible to provide credit assistance to a great many farmers who need and are eligible for such assistance.

The need for extending the present maximum repayment period of 5 years for farm operating loans and for increasing the period during which borrowers may continue to receive loan assistance is clearly indicated by the experience in the field of operating credit which the Farmers Home Administration has had and is clearly brought out as a result of studies made by the North Carolina Agricultural Experiment Station and the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis. The Farmers Home Administration records show that a higher percentage of borrowers remained on the program more than 5 years in areas requiring larger investments in operating capital than in those areas where relatively small investments are required. For example, in the Midwest where the pattern of farming represents a combination of livestock and such crops, 36 percent of the borrowers required more than 5 years to retire their operating loan indebtedness. The separate studies made recently by the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis and the North Carolina Agricultural Experiment Station also indicate that 5 years is not sufficient time for many family-type farmers to complete needed major adjustments in their farming operations. The results of these studies show that many farm operators cannot successfully undertake a balanced or diversified farm program unless, first, credit is available in adequate amounts during the adjustment period; and, second, the repayment schedule is extended over a sufficient number of years to permit the loans to

be repaid from the increased returns which materialize only after the improvement program is well under way.

I would like to comment briefly on the section of the bill which would authorize the deferment of initial annual payment for a period not exceeding two full crop years from the date of the loan in those instances where it is determined that anticipated farm income will not be sufficient to make the initial payment at an earlier date. This applies to both real estate and operating loans. Under present law, the repayment schedule must provide for annual repayments beginning with the year in which the loan is made. In assisting farmers in making major adjustments in their farming operations and in helping beginning farmers to become established to carry on sound operations, it is often found that the continuing costs exceed returns for the first 2 years when relatively large investments are needed in real estate improvements, and also in machinery, livestock and fencing. In many instances borrowers will not have sufficient income to make any repayments until the end of the second year. The present requirement that annual repayments be made on loans advanced by the Farmers Home Administration beginning with the year in which the loan is made presents a difficult problem in the administration of the operating loan program.

Title IV of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act presently requires that when a borrower has acquired sufficient equity in his farm to obtain a loan on a non-insured basis, the Secretary will require that the loan be refinanced. Some investors in insured farm mortgages make the initial loan with the purpose in mind of observing the progress of the borrower until such time as his equity in the farm is sufficient to enable the insured lender to take over the loan without the benefit of Government insurance. At present, such a lender, because of the legal requirements under which he operates, might find himself unable to take a loan on a noninsured basis. The final provision of this pending bill is intended to permit the holder of an insured mortgage to retain the mortgage under certain circumstances until he can take it over on a noninsured basis under the legal requirements under which he operates. The proposed amendment is considered desirable in maintaining good working relationship with lenders who desire to convert insured mortgages to conventional type real estate loans. The borrower will continue to have the option of selecting a lender of his own choosing at any time that he is able to obtain a loan from a private source.

The present production goals set for the farms throughout the country as part of our defense efforts are being accomplished magnificently as attested by recent crop reports. The farm people of America have again demonstrated their patriotism by producing in abundance the food and fiber so vitally needed. The enactment of this bill will assist them in continuing this record of production and will, at the same time, provide a sound and constructive farm credit for their future welfare.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I favor the bill before us, S. 684, which follows the principles enunciated by the bills introduced in the House by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] and by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES], both of whom are entitled to the thanks of this House for bringing here a bill that is so just in its merits and is so badly needed by the farmers of America at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I favor this bill and hope that the House will pass it unanimously. It provides that a qualified farmer may initially borrow, as an operating loan for his farm, up to \$7,000. The present law provides a limitation of \$3,500 for the first loan. This figure was fixed several years ago and does not reflect the increasing costs of the materials, equipment, and supplies that go today toward making an efficient farm-operating unit.

The bill goes further and provides that the total debt limit on production loans be raised from the present figure of \$5,000 to \$10,000. The wisdom of this provision is borne out when we realize that the cost of the average farm in the Southeast today is about \$6,800 and this does not include money for operating costs.

A third very important provision of the bill is that it extends from 5 to 7 years the period during which one of these operating loans must be repaid and provides that the Government may, in the light of existing conditions, allow to a farmer indebted to it under this program two full-crop years before he starts repaying this loan.

Mr. Speaker, I have the honor to represent an agricultural district. The Seventh Congressional District of Alabama has the largest number of farms of any congressional district of Alabama, a total of 34,431, according to the 1950 census. Cullman County, in the Seventh District, has 7,744 farms, the largest number of any county in the entire State of Alabama. Blount County has 4,747 farms; Walker has 4,354; Marion, 3,718; Pickens, 3,441; Franklin, 2,909; Lamar, 2,657; Fayette, 2,581; and Winston, 2,280; I recite these figures to show the large number of farms in our district, and with such a large number it necessarily means that they must be what are commonly called small farms. As a matter of fact the average size of all these farms would be considerably less than 100 acres each.

No industry in the past 20 years has made more rapid progress than has farming. Crops have been and are being diversified. New crops call for new methods of preparation, methods that are oftentimes very expensive. For instance, the cash outlay in converting cropland to pasture land is ordinarily somewhere in the neighborhood of \$30 per acre. The South, and particularly Alabama, is a growing cattle country. It is suited to the growth of cattle, hogs, and pastures. The little farmer needs



credit with which to convert to these new means of earning a better living for himself. This bill will go a long way toward aiding him to obtain the needed credit.

Last year I was invited to meet with various groups of farmers over the Seventh District, in open discussions of present farm needs. Invariably, I gathered the impression that there are thousands of farmers in the congressional district which I represent that now have the know-how to proceed to a more profitable type of farming for themselves and their families. The question is where are they to obtain the financing, the credit with which to make this adjustment. This bill goes a part of the way, at least, in the right direction.

We have provided very favorable terms, both as to credit and for tax purposes, for industrial expansion, and I have voted for these aids, with the knowledge that the country needed its industry greatly expanded to meet the threat of the war with communism that hangs so heavily over our land.

The farm is the basic unit of our preparedness. For, it is on the farm that we must produce the food and fiber for our own growing population, and to help feed the allies who join with us to stop the aggressions of communism. Our farms must be made strong in the production effort. Credit should be extended to them to the end that they become as efficient, as productive, as these times demand.

This is not a give-away program. This is not a socialistic program. The loans which this bill envisions will be repaid to the Government with interest. The interest will pay for the costs of administration of the program.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the following sections of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended (60 Stat. 1062), are hereby amended as follows:

Amend section 4 by striking out the words "and insuring mortgages" and "insure mortgages or" where they occur in said section and amend the last sentence of section 12 (b) to read as follows:

"With respect to any fiscal year, one-quarter of the amount available for insurance, commitments and acceptance of mortgages under this title shall be distributed among the several States and Territories on the basis of bona fide applications and the availability of farms with respect to which loans may be insured and the balance shall be distributed on the basis provided in section 4, and preferences shall be given to mortgages executed by veterans qualified under section 1."

SEC. 2. Amend section 21 to read:

"Sec. 21. (a) The Secretary may make loans to farmers and stockmen who are citizens of the United States for the purchase of livestock, seed, feed, fertilizer, farm equipment, supplies, and other farm needs, the cost of reorganizing the farming enterprise or changing farming practices to accomplish more diversified or more profitable farming operations, the refinancing of existing indebtedness, and for family subsistence.

"(b) No loan shall be made under this section for the purchase or leasing of land

or for carrying on of any land-purchase or land-leasing program. No initial loan to any one borrower under this section shall exceed \$7,000 and no further loan may be made under this section to a borrower so long as the total amount outstanding, including accrued interest, taxes and other obligations properly chargeable to the account of the borrower, exceeds \$10,000.

"(c) The terms of loans under this section, including any renewal or extension of any such loan, shall not exceed 7 years from the date the original loan was made.

"(d) No person who has failed to liquidate his indebtedness under this section for seven consecutive years shall be eligible for loans hereunder until he has paid such indebtedness in full, except that the indebtedness on loans made prior to November 1, 1946, which are being serviced and collected by the Farmers Home Administration, shall not be subject to the limitations of this section until November 1, 1953."

SEC. 3. Amend section 44 (c) by changing the period at the end of said section to a colon and adding the following proviso: "Provided however, That in the case of mortgage loans heretofore or hereafter insured under this title, the Secretary may at his discretion delay his request for refinancing until the borrower has acquired a sufficient equity in the farm to enable the holder of the insured mortgage to refinance the loan on an uninsured basis under laws or regulations to which he may be subject."

SEC. 4. Amend section 48 by adding at the end of said section the following sentence: "The foregoing requirements shall not preclude establishing the initial annual payment at a date not exceeding two full crop years from the date of the loan where the Secretary determines that farm income sufficient to make the initial payment cannot be readily anticipated at an earlier date, but this provision shall not have the effect of extending the maximum term of any loan."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. KILDAY asked and was given permission to address the House today for 10 minutes following any special orders heretofore entered.

#### INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House in the conference on the bill H. R. 3880 may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, is that the independent offices appropriation bill conference report?

Mr. PRIEST. It is.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I understand the intent is still to bring it up on Wednesday, on the regular program?

Mr. PRIEST. That is my understanding.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

#### PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF RULES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a statement and a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution to amend the Rules of the House so as to provide that standing committees and subcommittees are authorized to fix a lesser number than a majority as a quorum for the purpose of taking sworn testimony.

In my judgment, this is a necessary reform in the Rules of the House which will strengthen House committees and subcommittees and facilitate their investigative work.

I think it should be pointed out that if this amendment to the rules is adopted it will bring the Rules of the House in line with the Rules of the Senate as amended February 1, 1950, by Senate Resolution 180.

This action is made necessary by the holding of the Supreme Court in *Christoffel v. United States* ((1949) 338 U. S. 84), and under leave to extend my remarks I will include a statement explaining the amended rule and the circumstances which make its adoption desirable.

I hope the House will act promptly on this resolution.

The decision in *Christoffel* against *United States*, supra, was a remarkable holding. We witnessed the rather unusual and undignified spectacle of Members of Congress being subpoenaed before a jury of a court of the District of Columbia to testify whether or not they were present at the time certain allegedly perjurious statements were made by *Christoffel*.

Article IV of the Constitution provides that full faith and credit shall be given in each State to the public acts, records, and judicial proceedings of every other State and that the Congress may, by general laws, prescribe the manner in which such acts, records, and proceedings shall be proved, and the effect thereof.

It would seem on the surface that the records of the Congress and its committees should likewise be entitled to full faith and credit in the courts. A learned discussion of this principle is contained in an article in the *California Law Review* by Gerald Morgan, formerly legislative counsel for the House of Representatives—*Congressional Investigations and Judicial Review*, *California Law Review*, December 1949, volume 37, No. 4.

However, the *Christoffel* decision did not adopt the doctrine referred to above which would seem to be sound. Instead, the Supreme Court held in the *Christoffel* case that the Congress was at liberty to adopt whatever rules it saw fit for the conduct of its proceedings, but having once adopted the rules, the courts would review the manner in which those rules were observed, and that such observance was a matter of fact susceptible of proof before a jury.

The dissenting opinion in the *Christoffel* case pointed to the disastrous effects of the majority decision. It is to be hoped that when this matter again comes before the Supreme Court, the *Christoffel* holding will be overruled and

a better reasoned and clearer announcement of sound doctrine of legislative procedure will be made.

Nevertheless, under the existing state of the law there is presently available to the Congress in protection of its powers and the facility with which it conducts its business, only the remedy of amending its rules along the lines suggested in the resolution I have introduced.

Three things should be noted about the proposed amendment to the rules. First, it merely empowers standing committees and subcommittees to fix a lesser number than a majority as a quorum for the purpose of taking sworn testimony. Unless the standing committee or subcommittee takes formal action to reduce the number of members to constitute a quorum, a majority of the membership would be required. Second, it should be noted that the quorum provided by the amended rule would be for the sole and exclusive purpose of taking sworn testimony. A quorum for every other purpose of committee action would remain as it now is. Third, it should be noted that the amended rule prohibits one-man subcommittees by requiring that at least one member of the majority party and one member of the minority party be present to constitute a quorum.

The investigative function of the Congress is of extreme importance. It is the means whereby the Congress assembles the facts and considerations on subjects on which legislation is contemplated, and the means whereby the Congress observes the operation of the laws it has written. It should require no proof that there are many heavy demands upon the time of individual Members of the Congress. Many times there are important conflicting meetings which require a Member of Congress to be several places at the same time in the discharge of his duties. This makes it difficult to assemble a majority of the membership of a committee or subcommittee so as to constitute it a legal tribunal.

For example, the subcommittees of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, consist of eight members. Thus a majority of five members must be present to constitute a quorum under the present rules of the House. In the hearings which these committees have held in the Eighty-second Congress, there have been many occasions when less than five members were present during the taking of testimony. Technically and legally these subcommittees were not constituted as legal tribunals at those times when less than five members were present. A contempt of the committee either through refusal to testify, or otherwise, or through perjurious testimony, under the rule of the Christoffel case, could have been committed with impunity.

It is for the purpose of avoiding such weakness on the part of House committees and to give committees and subcommittees proper latitude for the effective conduct of their investigative work that it is necessary to reduce the number of members which will constitute a quorum for the taking of sworn testimony.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

*Resolved*, That rule XI (2) (f) of the Rules of the House of Representatives is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(f) The rules of the House are hereby made the rules of its standing committees so far as applicable, except that a motion to recess from day to day is hereby made a motion of high privilege in said committees, and except that each standing committee, and each subcommittee of any such committee, is authorized to fix a lesser number than a majority of its entire membership who shall constitute a quorum thereof for the purpose of taking sworn testimony: *Provided*, That such quorum shall consist of not less than one member of the majority party and one member of the minority party."

#### SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

(Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include certain tables and excerpts.)

#### FLOOD CONTROL, IRRIGATION, AND PUBLIC POWER FOR THE MISSOURI RIVER BASIN

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the recent floods that have occurred in the Missouri River Basin, particularly in the Kansas City area, have shocked the entire Nation. It will not be my purpose at this time to enumerate those flood losses. We do know that there were a number of lives lost, that hundreds of millions of dollars of homes, plants, and facilities were destroyed or greatly damaged and that a great deal of precious soil was washed away.

Without detracting from the magnitude of the Kansas City flood we should also remind ourselves that very damaging floods have occurred elsewhere in the Missouri River Basin. The floods came this year, they came last year, they came in practically every year. These uncontrolled waters are not only taking the lives of citizens but are washing away our highways, bridges, roads, factories, shops, our homes, and worst of all, they are washing away the productive surface of our good earth which cannot be rebuilt overnight.

It might be said that everyone believes in flood control and water and soil conservation. It is true, however, that at any given time there is a lot of opposition to this. Most of us have to wait until the water strikes us to be awakened to the need for controlling and utilizing our water resources. In the district that I have the honor to represent 130 or 140 lives have been taken by floods in the last decade. The damage to property has run into the millions and millions. Our soil is not as deep or as rich as it was before these devastating floods. This Nebraska territory passed on to the State of Kansas a great deal of the water that created the Nation-shocking havoc of recent weeks.

In the First Congressional District we have had severe flood losses this year. These have occurred in the Little Blue and the Big Blue and their tributaries, on Salt Creek, and on the Big Nemaha and the Little Nemaha and their tributaries

as well as several other streams and at some locations in the Republican River Basin.

On the Republican, the Bureau of Reclamation has already completed the Bonny, the Enders, and Medicine Creek Dams. The Trenton Dam also being built by the Bureau of Reclamation is well underway. All of these Bureau of Reclamation dams are in the upper basin of the Republican River. The Army engineers are now completing the Harlan County Dam which protects the lower part of the basin. While these Republican River dams provide for considerable irrigation they are all important flood-control structures. They will prevent the reoccurrence of the disasters that have happened so often in the Republican River Basin. These are the major structures. There is an urgent need for a few other smaller structures to be initiated—namely, the Red Willow, the Pioneer, and a few others.

It is well to point out that the Republican River flows in at the Kansas River and that the Kansas River joins the Missouri at Kansas City. Water held back in the Republican River Basin not only protects us from floods and prevents the washing away of our soil, but it makes a major contribution in the protection of Kansas City, St. Louis, and clear down to the mouth of the Mississippi River.

When a spectacular flood occurs it is carried in the headlines of every newspaper. Its account is told over every radio station and the scenes of the disaster are carried on our television networks. It makes the whole Nation conscious of the problem. Sometimes when the news is turned to other matters a portion of our people forget the problem. Sometimes we forget that a sound water-control program takes a number of years to complete. Many people are totally unaware of the flood-control work that has already been completed or initiated. Because of these factors a multitude of suggestions are made.

Those who believe in big Government and centralized control once more suggest the creation of a Missouri Valley Authority. They say that surely now the people of the Missouri River Basin will cease resisting the creation of the MVA. They imply that centralizing of authority, the creation of a large Government bureau, and the addition of hundreds of thousands of Government employees will stop floods per se.

What the MVA'ers apparently do not know is that the valley authority idea cannot be well adapted to a territory such as the Missouri River Basin. They do not know the problems of irrigation farming, they do not know what water rights are, they do not know that water rights and land ownership are inseparable, and very important, they do not know that there is already under way a flood control, irrigation, and public power construction program in the Missouri River Basin. It is successful, it is not failing, and what we need is more time and more money. It preserves the autonomy of the States. It is a cooperative effort on the part of the Federal Government, the State, and the citizens.



The Missouri River Basin comprises one-sixth of the area of the United States. It embraces parts of Missouri, Iowa, Kansas, North and South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Colorado, and all of the State of Nebraska. The productivity of this area is vital to the United States in both peace and war. It constitutes the most valuable physical asset in our Nation's economy.

Although the local planning, the promotion, the investigations, and the legislation for the Republican River Basin which is a part of the Missouri River Basin goes back prior to the beginning of World War II, the broad joint program of the Army Engineers-Bureau of Reclamation for the entire Missouri River Basin had its origin in 1943.

In the spring of 1943 the usual floods were occurring and threatening on the Missouri. It appeared that the damage might be very excessive. Representatives JENSEN and HOEVEN, of Iowa, and Representatives STEFAN, BUFFETT, and myself, of Nebraska, and others whose districts bordered on the river were in daily conference about the situation. The then Col. Lewis A. Pick was division engineer at Omaha. He was summoned before the Flood Control Committee of the House of Representatives. Among other things he stated that the Army could not protect Omaha, Kansas City, or the smaller towns and farms along the Missouri River with the dikes and levees alone, that we needed a broader program. A resolution was introduced by me calling for the studies and planning for a broader program for the Missouri River Basin. The Committee on Flood Control of the House passed that resolution. The Army engineers went to work and they brought in their flood-control program for this great area. It was based upon the idea that the water must be held back in Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, the Dakotas, Nebraska, and Kansas if the main stem of the Missouri River was to be controlled. It was known as the Pick plan.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman will recall that before the Kansas and Missouri floods occurred, the Members of the House who have districts along the Missouri River and also on the Republican River, where the gentleman is located, went to the Bureau of the Budget, and appeared before the Army Engineers, with a plea that some immediate work should be done on the upper Missouri River in order to hold back the waters which helped and assisted in the devastation which occurred in Missouri and Kansas; and that we were assured, especially along the Missouri River, that Fort Randall and Gavins Point would be completed simultaneously, but our plea to secure funds for immediate work and construction and planning along the Missouri River was refused.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

I might say there have been two things that have held back the flood-control

program in the Missouri River Basin more than anything else. One was the stop orders issued by the President to hold up construction provided for by the Congress, particularly in 1947; and the second one has been that throughout recent years the Bureau of the Budget, which is the President's arm, has laid down and stuck to the policy of no new beginnings in flood-control work, whether carried on by the Army Engineers or the Bureau of Reclamation.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. In relation to the time when flood moneys were frozen, I recall that it was on August 2, 1946, that Congress adjourned. The bill for flood control and public works had been signed about 10 days before that. The President had had a number of Members down there and passed out pens and said it was a great step forward, which it was. A fine flood-control bill. But the House adjourned on August 2, 1946, and on August 3, 1946, with a letter written on August 2, the President sent up a letter freezing the funds for this great project. It set back some 50 percent the work that was to be done; stopped it in its tracks. I was dismayed the other day when the President made a political statement, when he came back from the flood areas, that it would be necessary to elect some Members who believed in flood control and so forth. But the President himself froze at least 50 percent of this fund the day after the Congress adjourned. The echoes had hardly died down in this hall when that was done. He should remember that when he talks about stopping flood-control work.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HOEVEN. I want to join in what the gentleman from Nebraska has just said about the work in the Missouri River Basin under the Pick-Sloan plan; that it had been unduly retarded on account of the direct action taken by the President of the United States in freezing the funds, as he did, as far back as 1946. I think the people of the Missouri Valley Basin do not have such short memories that they will likely forget that that was done, and are going to take with a grain of salt the political pronouncements of the President that it has been on account of the opposition of midwestern Congressmen that this flood-control project has not been continued. I would ask the gentleman this question: Does not the gentleman feel that, in addition to the reasons he gave, we should also add the fact that the Pick-Sloan plan has been retarded to a great extent because it has been approached on a piecemeal basis; we have been spending millions and millions of dollars to build revetments and levees, and retarding dams, only to have them washed out by the recurring floodwaters, and that has been one of the main reasons why the over-all plan has been unduly retarded.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Perhaps so. It is true that you cannot judge a plan until the major structures are built. That is something that the advocates of MVA forget entirely, that what we have constructed out there has prevented floods.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman knows that the district which I have the honor to represent has suffered because of the lack of flood-control construction along the main stem of the Missouri River, a distance of about 120 miles, for many years past to a greater degree possibly than any other district on the main stem of the Missouri River. I believe the gentleman will agree that that is a fact.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I think that is correct.

Mr. JENSEN. So it has been a live issue with me and my people. About every other year at least we have had levee break-throughs; the flood waters coming down from that great area in the Northwest would wash away our levees and flood great areas. At this present time, right now, there are thousands upon thousands of acres along that Missouri River from Sioux City to Omaha and Council Bluffs, Iowa, that are under water due to the fact that our channel maintenance and bank erosion funds which the Army engineers have requested year after year have been continually cut by 25 to 50 percent by the Bureau of the Budget. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN], the gentlemen from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN, Mr. MILLER, Mr. BUFFETT, and Mr. CURTIS], and I have done everything possible to try to explain why it was necessary to spend a little more money to safeguard these folks against these terrific floods.

This year the Army engineers asked for \$7,500,000 for channel maintenance and bank-erosion control from Sioux City to Kansas City. The Bureau of the Budget reduced that to \$4,500,000. I understand the Senate has not raised that amount even though a number of us who represent the districts, including the Senators from the States of Iowa and Nebraska, appeared before the committees that have the job to do of passing on these civil-functions items. But they did not heed our pleas; they have simply followed the Bureau of the Budget; hence the millions and millions of dollars of construction that has already been done has been destroyed to about 50 to 60 percent, to say nothing about the terrific damage which has been done to the farms and to property through the eating away of the banks, acre by acre, day after day. Nothing was done; it seemed like no one got excited until this terrific catastrophe happened farther down the stream.

There is something else I think should be mentioned, in 1948 the Congress authorized the Soil Conservation Service and the Forest Service to make a survey

of the entire Missouri Valley to determine what should be done in the way of conserving the soil, the water, and the timber.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I thank the gentleman, but if he will pardon me, I am coming to that part of the program a little later, and I would be glad to have him make his observation at that time.

Mr. JENSEN. I want to compliment the gentleman for bringing this to the attention of the country; for, certainly, unless we hold the water in the upper reaches of the Missouri Valley we may expect another flood of as great or even greater degree than that which has just recently happened in Kansas City and Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Several have mentioned the action of the Bureau of the Budget. That has operated against flood control in two ways. When the budget says no new project starts, it curtails funds, it makes it next to impossible to get more money from the Congress; but in other parts of it the budget allocates billions and billions of

dollars to be spread around the world. So that it not only holds back what needs to be done here, but it takes the available tax money and allocates it elsewhere.

I want to get back to the legislative history of this program.

The following year the flood-control committee of which I was a member favorably reported legislation to authorize the Pick plan. When the Army was making their studies, studies were also initiated by the Bureau of Reclamation. By the time the flood-control bill reached the Senate the Bureau of Reclamation had completed their plan. It was known as the Sloan plan. It carried the idea of storing the water far up in the headwaters—farther than had the Army. It contained plans for the irrigation of wide areas. Both programs carried plans for the generation of power. There was conflict between the Army engineers and the Bureau. Much of it was reconciled then. The Senate added the Sloan plan to the flood-control bill. In the conference on the flood-control bill the joint Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation plans for the Missouri River

Basin were accepted. The House approved the conference report and thus adopted the Sloan plan also. It has since been known as the Pick-Sloan plan or the Army Engineers-Bureau of Reclamation Program for the Missouri River Basin. Its initial authorization goes back to the 1944 Flood Control Act. Since then it has been expanded with new authorizations but its basic concept has not changed and it has gone forward since that time.

Mr. DEWART. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. DEWART. It was also approved by every State in the basin?

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. That is correct.

Mr. Speaker, I have asked the Army engineers to prepare a list of flood-control structures that have been completed and those now under construction and those ready for construction in the Missouri River Basin under this program. That list prepared by the Army is as follows, which I have herewith inserted:

Comprehensive flood-control program of Corps of Engineers in Missouri River Basin

Project	Cost	Remarks	Project	Cost	Remarks
Projects completed:			Authorized projects not under construction—Continued		
Glasgow, Mont., local protection.....	\$22,000	Levee.	West Point, Nebr., local protection.....	\$128,000	Levee.
Fort Peck Reservoir, Mont.....	136,900,000	3,500,000 acre-feet. <sup>1</sup>	Waterloo, Nebr., local protection.....	87,000	Do.
Belle Fourche, S. Dak., local protection.....	37,400	Levee and flood wall.	Battle Creek, Nebr., local protection.....	284,000	Levee and channel improvement.
Schuyler, Nebr., local protection.....	74,940	Local protection.	Giles Creek, Nebr., local protection.....	414,000	Channel improvement.
Bartley, Nebr., local protection.....	203,800	Levee and channel improvement.	Havre, Mont., local protection.....	2,075,000	
Topeka, Kans., local protection.....	745,830	Levee and flood wall.	Harlem, Mont., local protection.....	69,000	
Forsythe, Mont., local protection.....	280,200	Do.	Saco, Mont., local protection.....	27,500	
Hamburg, Iowa, local protection.....	236,000	Levee and channel improvement.	Wibaux, Mont., local protection.....	42,300	
Mandan, N. Dak., local protection.....	644,700	Levee.	Beulah, N. Dak., local protection.....	118,000	
Hot Springs, S. Dak., local protection.....	1,240,200	Channel improvements.	Marmarth, N. Dak., local protection.....	19,000	
Council Bluffs, Iowa, local protection.....	2,595,800	Levee, flood wall and channel improvement.	Dakotas diversion (from Garrison Reservoir).	35,000,000	
Indianola, Nebr., local protection.....	151,200	Levee and channel improvement.	Big Bend Reservoir, S. Dak.....	45,000,000	
Kanopolis Reservoir, Kans.....	12,167,000	397,000 acre-feet. <sup>1</sup>	Gavins Point Reservoir, S. Dak. and Nebr.....	44,900,000	165,000 acre-feet. <sup>1</sup>
Iola, Kans., local protection.....	22,290	Local protection.	Sioux City, Iowa, local protection.....	1,600,000	
Cherry Creek Reservoir, Colo.....	15,700,000	90,000 acre-feet. <sup>1</sup>	Pioneer Reservoir, Colo. and Kans.....	15,700,000	87,000 acre-feet. <sup>1</sup>
Total.....	171,021,360		Morrison, Colo., local protection.....	559,000	
Projects under construction:			Tuttle Creek Reservoir, Kans.....	71,573,000	1,600,000 acre-feet. <sup>1</sup>
Garrison Reservoir, N. Dak.....	278,195,000	4,250,000 acre-feet. <sup>1</sup>	Lawrence, Kans., local protection.....	163,100	
Fort Randall Reservoir, S. Dak.....	197,300,000	2,500,000 acre-feet. <sup>1</sup>	Chillicothe Reservoir, Mo.....	49,841,000	
Omaha, Nebr., local protection project.....	5,745,000		Osceola Reservoir, Mo.....	88,163,000	
Harland County Reservoir, Nebr.....	46,730,000	500,000 acre-feet. <sup>1</sup>	South Grand Reservoir, Mo.....	18,304,000	
Kansas Cities local protection project, Missouri and Kansas.....	41,389,000		Pomme de Terre Reservoir, Mo.....	19,828,000	403,000 acre-feet. <sup>1</sup>
Kenslers Bend, Mo. to Sioux City, Iowa (including Miners Bend), local protection project.....	10,000,000		Richland Reservoir, Mo.....	26,874,000	813,100 acre-feet. <sup>1</sup>
Missouri River agricultural levees.....	124,837,000	3,500,000 acre-feet. <sup>1</sup>	Arlington Reservoir, Mo.....	21,508,000	590,000 acre-feet. <sup>1</sup>
Aten, Nebr., local protection project.....	500,000	5,740 acre-feet. <sup>1</sup>	Cottonwood Springs Reservoir, S. Dak.....	1,102,000	5,915 acre-feet. <sup>1</sup>
Oahe Reservoir, N. Dak. and S. Dak.....	269,600,000		Red Willow Reservoir, Nebr.....	10,017,000	22,000 acre-feet. <sup>1</sup>
Cold Brook Reservoir, S. Dak.....	1,937,000		Total.....	512,489,400	
Chariton River, Iowa and Mo., channel improvement.....	2,740,000		Recommended or proposed projects:		
Little Sioux River, Iowa.....	4,100,000		North Topeka, Kans.....	1,365,000	
Total.....	983,073,000		Lawrence, Kans.....	25,000	
Authorized projects not under construction:			Abilene, Kans.....	281,000	
Chatfield Reservoir, Colo.....	26,551,000	180,000 acre-feet. <sup>1</sup>	Salina, Kans.....	882,000	
Boulder, Colo., local protection.....	451,000	Channel improvement.	Marysville, Kans.....	221,700	
Erie, Colo., local protection.....	46,590	Levee.	Beatrice, Nebr.....	439,500	
South Platte River.....			Hubbel, Nebr.....	6,400	
Agricultural levees.....	24,351,000	Agricultural levees.	Manhattan, Kans.....	287,000	
Channel improvement.....	1,552,000	Channel improvement.	Fort Riley, Kans.....	69,000	
Greybull, Wyo., local protection.....	600,000	Levee.	Merriam, Kans.....	262,000	
Monarch, Wyo., local protection.....	194,000	Do.	Stonchouse Creek, Kans.....	126,000	
Dayton, Wyo., local protection.....	98,000	Levee and channel improvement.	Perry Reservoir, Kans.....	11,697,000	187,000 acre-feet. <sup>1</sup>
Sheridan, Wyo., local protection.....	1,906,000	Levee, flood wall, channel improvement.	Milford Reservoir, Kans.....	26,143,000	700,000 acre-feet. <sup>1</sup>
Buffalo, Wyo., local protection.....	520,000	Diversion.	Pomona Reservoir, Kans.....	9,078,000	155,000 acre-feet. <sup>1</sup>
Miles City, Mont., local protection.....	1,037,000	Levee and channel improvement.	Melvorn Reservoir, Kans.....	13,000,000	170,000 acre-feet. <sup>1</sup>
Norfolk, Nebr., local protection.....	2,213,000	Do.	Hillsdale Reservoir, Kans.....	5,924,000	77,000 acre-feet. <sup>1</sup>
Pierce, Nebr., local protection.....	174,000	Do.	Garnett Reservoir, Kans.....	9,865,000	160,000 acre-feet. <sup>1</sup>
			Fort Scott Reservoir, Kans.....	10,674,000	130,750 acre-feet. <sup>1</sup>
			Kasinger Bluff Reservoir, Mo.....	71,536,000	3,918,000 acre-feet. <sup>1</sup>
			Hackleman Corner Reservoir, Mo.....	10,745,000	212,300 acre-feet. <sup>1</sup>
			Stockton Reservoir, Mo.....	27,111,000	774,000 acre-feet. <sup>1</sup>
			Ottawa, Kans.....	975,000	
			Osawatimie, Kans.....	442,000	
			Marmarth, N. Dak.....	171,150	
			Rathbun Reservoir, Iowa.....	14,550,000	327,000 acre-feet. <sup>1</sup>
			Mystic, Iowa.....	29,600	
			Total.....	215,905,350	

<sup>1</sup>Flood-control storage.



*Comprehensive flood-control program of Corps of Engineers in Missouri River Basin*

**AUTHORIZED REPORTS NOT YET COMPLETED**

Avoca and South Creeks and their tributaries, Dixon and Dakota Counties, Nebr., improvements for flood control and drainage. Missouri River, for flood control and allied purposes on Big Tarkio River, in Holt County, Mo.

Bow Creek and tributaries, Nebr., with a view to flood control and drainage.

Fishing River, Mo., and its tributaries, with a view to improvements for flood control and allied purposes in vicinity of Excelsior Springs, Clay County, Mo.

Loup River Basin, Nebr., with a view to flood protection at and in the vicinity of Broken Bow and Sargent, Nebr.

Missouri River, for control of floods on the lower Heart River and its tributaries, in the vicinity of Mandan, N. Dak.

Missouri River, with a view to flood control on Indian Creek watershed by the construction of a diversion tube to the Missouri River and a series of small check dams in upper Indian Creek watershed.

Missouri River from the vicinity of the Iowa-Nebraska line near Watson, Mo., to the vicinity of Leavenworth, Kans.

Missouri River at the Kansas City, Mo. and Kans., protection from floods of Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad tracks and the Wabash Railroad tracks.

Lamine and Blackwater Rivers, Mo., flood control, drainage, and allied purposes.

Missouri River and tributaries, with a view to determining whether flood protection at, and in the vicinity of, Leavenworth, Kans., is advisable at this time.

Three Mile Creek, vicinity of Leavenworth, Kans., with a view to flood control.

Nemaha River and Little Nemaha River and their tributaries, Nebr. and Kans., for flood control.

Little Papillion Creek, Nebr., in interest of drainage and flood control.

Creve Coeur Creek, St. Louis County, Mo., with a view to flood control.

Missouri River and tributaries, for flood control and allied purposes on Nodaway River.

Missouri and One Hundred and Two Rivers, Mo., sections in Buchanan, Clay, and Platte Counties, Mo.

Missouri River and tributaries, for flood control on Platte River, Mo. and Iowa.

Missouri River, for drainage and flood control on Omaha Creek, Nebr.

Missouri River, effect of Squaw Creek National Wildlife Refuge on flood conditions on land adjacent thereto, and for flood con-

trol and allied purposes on Squaw and Little Tarkio Creeks, Holt County, Mo.

Missouri River, with a view to flood protection along the Sun River, Mont.

Missouri River, with a view to flood protection along Wier Creek and its tributaries, Missouri.

Weeping Water Creek, Nebr., in the interest of drainage and flood control.

The Bureau of Reclamation carries on a great flood-control program. Many people do not realize this. They think of the Bureau of Reclamation as operating in the very arid regions only. In the Missouri River Basin is the place where the arid meets the humid region. We have need both for flood control and for irrigation. It is logical that both the Army and the Bureau should be interested in that territory. It is sound that their programs have been merged and that they are jointly undertaking the job.

Mr. Speaker, likewise, I have had the Bureau of Reclamation prepare a list of those structures that have been completed, those now under construction, and those awaiting construction, which I herewith insert:

*Bureau of Reclamation data on multipurpose dams completed, under construction, or proposed in the Missouri River Basin which have flood-control benefits<sup>1</sup>*

Storage dam	Total estimated cost	Cost to June 30, 1951, estimated	Total capacity, exclusive of superstorage (acre-feet)	Flood-control capacity, exclusive of superstorage (acre-feet)	Drainage area (square miles)	Location		Remarks
						State	Stream	
Completed:								
Angostura.....	\$9,420,000	\$9,420,000	160,000	0	9,100	South Dakota.....	Cheyenne.....	Reservoir will provide 60,000-acre-feet of super- storage for flood con- trol.
Bonny.....	13,339,000	13,185,000	175,000	132,000	1,779	Colorado.....	South Republican.....	
Cedar Bluff.....	14,675,000	14,064,000	373,900	188,700	5,270	Kansas.....	Smoky Hill.....	
Dickinson.....	1,390,000	1,363,000	16,500	9,500	405	North Dakota.....	Heart.....	
Enders.....	8,400,000	8,340,000	74,500	30,000	2,240	Nebraska.....	Frenchman Creek.....	
Heart Butte.....	3,696,000	3,666,000	225,500	150,000	1,810	North Dakota.....	Heart.....	
Medicine Creek.....	7,006,000	6,930,000	92,300	52,300	860	Nebraska.....	Medicine Creek.....	
Subtotal.....	57,926,000	56,968,000	1,117,700	562,500	21,464			
Under construction:								
Boysen.....	28,222,000	25,959,808	970,000	0	7,700	Wyoming.....	Big Horn.....	Reservoir will provide 523,000 acre-feet of su- perstorage for flood control.
Canyon Ferry.....	20,357,000	10,530,000	2,043,000	1,000,000	15,860	Montana.....	Missouri.....	
Keyhole.....	4,394,000	2,846,589	340,000	140,000	1,910	Wyoming.....	Belle Fourche.....	
Shadehill.....	6,971,000	6,830,000	358,000	216,000	3,070	South Dakota.....	Grand.....	
Trenton.....	21,853,000	8,810,000	256,600	133,800	1,893	Nebraska.....	Republican.....	
Subtotal.....	81,797,000	54,976,397	3,967,600	1,489,800	30,433			
Ready for construction but awaiting construction funds:								
Bixby.....	11,015,000	1,143,335	215,000	125,000	1,810	South Dakota.....	Moreau.....	
Cannonball.....	9,025,000	586,773	245,000	165,000	1,410	North Dakota.....	Cannonball.....	
Glendo.....	21,935,000	60,000	800,000	275,000	15,550	Wyoming.....	North Platte.....	
Narrows.....	32,410,000	760,000	700,000	250,000	13,397	Colorado.....	South Platte.....	
Jamestown.....	6,455,000	65,000	230,000	200,000	(2)	North Dakota.....	James.....	
Lovewell.....	9,042,000	174,000	94,000	50,000	(2)	Kansas.....	White Rock.....	
Tiber.....	23,560,000	692,000	1,313,000	400,000	4,850	Montana.....	Marias.....	
Yellowtail.....	68,391,000	1,601,016	1,375,000	259,000	17,000	do.....	Big Horn.....	
Subtotal.....	181,833,000	5,082,124	4,972,000	1,724,000	54,017			
Being readied for construction:								
Ashton.....	10,500,000		90,000	4,000	(2)	Nebraska.....	Oak Creek.....	Reservoir will provide 768,000 acre-feet of su- perstorage for flood control.
Clark Canyon.....	6,030,000		204,000	50,000	2,500	Montana.....	Beaverhead.....	
Davis.....	22,960,000		250,000	243,000	92	Nebraska.....	Davis Creek.....	
Kirwin.....	13,975,000	355,000	200,000	105,000	1,415	Kansas.....	North Fork Solomon.....	
Lake Solitude.....	845,000		7,600	500	14	Wyoming.....	Paintrock.....	
Medicine Lake.....	29,518,000	93,700	5,442,000	0	(2)	Montana.....	Big Muddy Creek.....	
Middle Fork.....	6,880,000		120,000	60,000	480	Wyoming.....	Middle Fork, Powder River.....	
Moorhead.....	25,530,000	1,624,261	1,150,000	250,000	8,080	Montana.....	Powder.....	
Pactola.....	10,992,000	223,788	93,000	43,000	335	South Dakota.....	Rapid Creek.....	
Red Gulch.....	4,368,000		15,000	2,000	(2)	Wyoming.....	Shell Creek.....	
Weta.....	15,000,000		550,000	300,000	(2)	South Dakota.....	White River.....	
Subtotal.....	133,098,000	2,296,749	8,130,600	1,057,500	12,916			
Grand total.....	454,654,000	119,323,270	18,187,900	4,833,800	118,830			

<sup>1</sup> In addition to the dams listed below for the Missouri River Basin there are some 50 additional multipurpose dams under preliminary investigations in the basin which will have flood control benefits but for which detailed information is not available. It is estimated the total storage capacity which will be made available by the construction of the latter dams will aggregate about 17,000,000 acre-feet.

<sup>2</sup> Information not available.

Mr. Speaker, the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation are doing a great job in the Missouri River Basin. The soil-conservation districts and the

individual farmers have been doing a good job in soil and water conservation in the Missouri River Basin. A gap in this program has been recognized by all

of us for a number of years. There is need for a conservation program larger than the individual farmer or his soil-conservation district can carry, yet not

of the size or the cost of dams that the Bureau of Reclamation and the Army engineers would build. This has been called an agricultural flood control program. It is a soil-saving, flood-control, and water-conserving program that does the job in the area between the individual efforts and the Bureau of Reclamation or the Army.

This agricultural program is very important. It is important because of its soil saving and because it does retard floods. In addition to that it prolongs the life of the reservoirs of the Army and the Bureau. It makes our farms more productive. It involves small water retarding structures, tree planting, and other changes in land use and like undertakings.

The Department of Agriculture prepared a flood-control program for the Missouri River Basin. It was originally called the Young plan. When it reached the Department of Agriculture many other programs not dealing directly with soil and water were added. It became a big program, and it has never been authorized as one undertaking. I am sure that many of the people living in the Missouri River Basin, particularly in Nebraska and Iowa, feel that the agricultural small watershed programs are preferred to the broad programs for the entire area which are so involved. There is much to be said for a valley-by-valley approach.

The Little Sioux watershed in Iowa is the only watershed in the Missouri River Basin authorized for the installation of works of improvement for runoff and waterflow retardation and soil-erosion prevention in accordance with the flood-control acts of Congress.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HOEVEN. Let me say that the Little Sioux River project is almost entirely within my congressional district, part of it also being in the congressional district represented by my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. JENSEN. That soil conservation program is the pattern that has been set up and is being followed throughout the United States and has been making wonderful progress in northwest Iowa. The only tragedy of it is that the funds have been so reduced that they have not been able to complete the job which should have been consummated many years ago.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. There has been wide discussion of the soil-conservation program which the gentleman has just mentioned, as well as of the Pick-Sloan plan proper in my State, and the discussion has taken a form that would indicate that some people regard the one plan as a substitute for the other. I would like to have the gentleman state whether he thinks the soil-conservation plan would or could serve as a substitute for the program of the Army engineers plus the program of the Reclamation Service, or whether the Army engineers' plan plus that of the Reclamation Serv-

ice could serve as a substitute for the soil conservation plan, or whether the plans should be considered as supplementing each other?

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I can give the gentleman my opinion on it. I think the programs should supplement each other. In fact, I do not believe that with the best soil conservation practices and with the best flood control program you could entirely eliminate the needs for some of the larger dams; in fact, many of them. On the other hand, if you do not have the program on the farm extending clear up into the far reaches, at the beginning of the creeks, you will find that you will still lose your soil and the reservoir that you built on the stream will fill up much quicker with silt. They are both necessary.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Is it not a fact that General Pick recognizes the need for soil conservation, which actually is flood prevention, and encourages valley-wide watershed programs of soil conservation organizations to hold the raindrops where they fall so that it will keep the silt out of the main stem and keep the soil where it belongs? I know that he does.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I think that is correct.

Mr. JENSEN. And he is working with the Soil Conservation Service. I might say it has taken some time for everyone to get in perfect harmony on this program, this triple program of the Reclamation Service, the Soil Conservation, and the Army engineers, but they are very well harmonized. There is no difference, no great difference, at all, and the program is being run from the top by the governors of the 10 States who are elected by the people as against a river-valley authority where three men are appointed and run an empire within our great American empire.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. The gentleman is correct. The conflict between the departments is greatly overstated. It is an argument being used by those who would force upon the territory a Missouri Valley Authority. It is not supported by the facts.

In the last 10 years much progress has been made in getting the departments to work together. This so-called Pick-Sloan plan provides an ideal arrangement whereby the Federal Government has its jurisdiction and States' rights are recognized, and the States are consulted through these committees. That was set up in the conference between the House and the Senate in the Flood Control Act of 1944. I had something to do with it then as a conferee. It has worked well.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. It is my understanding that the Soil Conservation people actually state that even if their program were completely implemented there still would be the necessity for flood control.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I think that is correct.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. That would be borne out, too, by the fact that the largest flood we have had in the lower Missouri was in 1844, when we did not have the problem of soil conservation because there were no farms in that area.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. That is right.

Mr. AANDAHL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. AANDAHL. I want to join with the gentleman from Nebraska, the gentleman from Iowa, and the gentleman from Missouri in stating that the functions of the three Departments, the Department of Agriculture, the Corps of Engineers, and the Bureau of Reclamation, supplement each other.

It was my privilege to be a member of the Missouri Basin States Committee for 6 years, and of the Missouri Basin Inter-Agency Committee for 4½—nearly 5 years. It was our purpose on that committee particularly during the last 3 years to encourage the Department of Agriculture to expand its soil conservation program in the Missouri Basin in order that it might supplement the work that was being done by the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation.

I am very strongly in favor of the coordinated plan, as contrasted with Authority administration in the basin. I think in that particular area out there we need the long years of experience of the Bureau of Reclamation in irrigation projects, and we need the long years of experience of the Corps of Engineers in flood control, and we need the long years of experience of the Department of Agriculture in the soil-conservation work that is needed in the adaptation of farming practices to the needs of the valley. I think the coordinated plan is definitely the plan we want.

Incidentally, that plan is enlarged even beyond the three departments we have mentioned. On the Inter-Agency Committee we have the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Department of Agriculture, the Federal Power Commission, and the Department of Commerce represented.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. LOVRE. I want to compliment the gentleman on the statement he is making, and I certainly want to join with him in every word he has said.

Is it not true that all the Governors in the Missouri River Basin are for the Pick-Sloan plan and have been for the past number of years?

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I think that is correct.

Mr. LOVRE. Is it not true further that as far as the Pick-Sloan plan is concerned it is a construction plan and not an administration plan?

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. That is right.



Mr. LOVRE. Is it not true that as far as a Missouri Valley Authority is concerned that is only an administration plan?

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Yes. The idea of a Missouri Valley Authority just does not fit in with our economy out there at all. There has never been any experience with a Valley Authority where you had irrigation farming based upon water rights owned by the farmer that were inseparable from the ownership of the land.

Mr. LOVRE. I want to make one further observation, that as far as the people of South Dakota are concerned they are definitely for States' rights. They are definitely behind what is known as the Pick-Sloan plan. This applies not only to the people but to the press of our State. I believe you will find the same thing is true with the press in the other States in the Missouri Valley Basin.

Mr. JENSEN. And the people.

Mr. LOVRE. And the people, yes.

President Truman's attempt to throw the Missouri River program into politics, through his letter to Phil Murray, of the CIO, is merely a threat held out to advance his program of concentration of power in the Federal Government.

The Pick-Sloan plan is a plan for construction of river projects while the Missouri Valley Authority is a plan for administration of the projects after construction. There is no common ground for discussing the two plans. A Missouri Valley Authority could not and would not expedite the building of the dams which is of paramount importance at this time.

Rather than playing politics with the misery of the Kansas and Missouri floods it seems to me that we should lend every effort to acceleration of the program already authorized by Congress which is now in various stages of construction.

Consideration of a switch from one program to another at this time can only retard the building of the dams which are so necessary in order to prevent future flood disasters.

It is my hope that funds provided in the budget for flood control and river development will be restored by the Senate and concurred in by the conferees. The recent floods have made legislators from all over the country more conscious of the disastrous results which follow when no attempt is made to curb the floodwaters.

In addition, recent work by Governor Sigurd Anderson and representatives from Pierre, Yankton, and Huron have helped to lay a solid foundation for requests for funds for South Dakota projects.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. The gentleman's remarks a moment ago about the need for tying together the entire program of soil conservation and the flood-control, dam-construction program, is very appropriate and very timely. More than two-thirds of the State of Iowa drains into the Mississippi River in my

district. In 1913, we had a dam constructed at Keokuk, and if you want a prize example of the silting that comes from drainage into a dam without soil construction above it, you have it up there in the Keokuk Dam. It is badly silted in. It has destroyed much of the usefulness of that dam for power development. It is a continuing problem with us. We also have a serious flood situation in the tributaries of the Mississippi River along the Des Moines River. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LECOMPTE], and I have been working on a dam project on the Des Moines River for many years. We have a problem on the Cedars River and the Iowa River. There is a dam now being constructed near Iowa City on the Iowa River in my district. We have the levee problem along the Mississippi River. We are constantly aware of the need for flood control. We have ample proof in the Keokuk silting problem of the need of soil conservation work upstream and in the tributaries. I commend the gentleman very highly on the breadth and scope and timeliness of his discussion.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. D'EWARD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. D'EWARD. I call the attention of the House to the fact that this is not only an irrigation and flood-control project. The Pick-Sloan plan also envisions the development of the mineral resources in the basin and the conservation of fish and wildlife, and the development of recreational facilities, and navigation. In short, it is a multiple-purpose plan for the development of all the resources and not only of irrigation and flood control work.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. It also includes power, which I have not dwelt on today because in recent weeks our minds have been turned to the devastating floods, and I wanted to submit for the RECORD what is being done about flood control.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. During our recent tour in Kansas, several tests were made of the Kansas River at the peak of the flood, and it was found that one-tenth of the volume going down the river was top soil. Specimens were taken at Kansas City, Mo., and Topeka, and at Lawrence. That is one-tenth of the volume going down the river was top soil, and the best of river and bottom lands throughout the Midwest.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. LECOMPTE. The remarks of the gentleman from Nebraska are especially timely now when we have had the devastating experience of these terrible floods. The thought occurs to me that any satisfactory flood-control program will have to be a long-range program,

and will have to have not only flood-control dams, but the dams will have to be supplemented by upstream water control clear to the point where the rainfall strikes the land. It will have to be done to a considerable extent by the individual farmers who practice conservation measures by terracing and contouring the land, and slowing down the flow of the water. Nevertheless, it never will be entirely solved by contouring and other farm practices. I talked with geologists who told me that in the Des Moines River valley undoubtedly there were greater floods than we have ever seen, in prehistoric times before the plow had ever been brought to Iowa. In other words, even the prairie sod saw floods down the Des Moines River Valley. It will have to be a plan whereby soil conservation practices and work will be supplemented by the dams built by the Army engineers along our inland streams. Does the gentleman agree with me?

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Yes, you have to have both. Farther west, when you get out into my State, we also have to utilize that water for irrigation just as much as we can.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Last year, under the one-package appropriation bill, as the gentleman will recall, the conferees threw out all savings which the House and Senate had made, and then they provided that the Bureau of the Budget should reduce the amount therein appropriated by the Congress to a sum not less than \$550,000,000. The gentleman remembers that?

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I do.

Mr. JENSEN. What happened? Fifty million dollars was stricken from the flood-control item which the Congress had provided, and again the Army engineers' program was thrown into a cocked hat, and the Missouri Valley flood-control program suffered no end because of that action by the conferees.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Yes.

Mr. JENSEN. And we delegated the power of Congress to one individual, who was the right hand of the President of the United States.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. The record is well established that the Executive, instead of leading the way for conservation in the Missouri River Basin, has retarded it time after time. It has been mentioned that the stop order was placed on construction in 1946. They held up an important dam on one of the tributaries of the Republican River, where in one flood we lost 110 lives. What happened? On the Saturday before election the stop order was released, and announced by the Democratic Party officials in Nebraska. That is the sort of difficulties we have had to overcome in carrying forward this program.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I would like to join with others in commending the gentleman from Nebraska on his very thoughtful and careful consideration of this problem which affects nearly one-third of the United States; namely, the work of conservation, flood control, irrigation, and power production in the Missouri River Basin. I am especially impressed by two factors that the gentleman has mentioned. One is the thought that there should be some degree of local control over these problems which directly affect millions of inhabitants of the Missouri River Basin. The second idea, that there should be coordination, and cooperation, voluntary, between the various departments of Government that have to do with this big problem. I commend the gentleman heartily.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. SCHWABE. I want to commend the gentleman for the wide scope that he has covered with reference to this subject and especially to commend him for the fact that he has emphasized the importance of the correlation of these various agencies. We have suffered a tremendous loss recently in Oklahoma on account of the floods. The rivers descend through Kansas, on down through my district, and have created devastating floods. We are all in favor of taking care of the devastation, but from now on let us see if we cannot constructively apply the methods of flood prevention, even more important than flood control, rather than devastation benefits after the floods have descended and the damage has been done. In our part of the country we are not for the valley authority, but for the program which the gentleman has outlined.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I thank the gentleman. I think he has made a real contribution in pointing out that we need to prevent these floods. An inch of top soil taken away takes hundreds of years to rebuild.

But may I go on with my text with reference to the agricultural program.

The Salt-Wahoo watersheds in Nebraska constitute the only area in the Missouri River Basin where studies are now in progress leading to the development of a program of works of improvement for runoff and waterflow retardation and soil-erosion prevention in accordance with the Flood Control Acts of Congress.

There are 11 watersheds in the Missouri River Basin for which resolutions by the Committees on Public Works in the House and Senate have authorized studies leading to the development of a program of works of improvement in accordance with the Flood Control Act of 1936, as amended and supplemented. At present funds are not available for

carrying out the studies. A list of the watersheds is attached:

# RESOLUTIONS BY COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC WORKS IN THE MISSOURI RIVER BASIN

Big Blue River watershed, Nebraska: Authorized by the committee of the House of Representatives.

Delaware River watershed, Kansas: Authorized by the committee of the House of Representatives.

Little Nemaha watershed, Nebraska: Authorized by the committee of the Senate.

Nemaha River watershed, including Little Nemaha River watershed, Nebraska: Authorized by the committee of the House of Representatives.

Salt Creek-Wahoo Basin, Nebraska: Authorized by the committee of the House of Representatives.

Weeping Water Creek watershed, Nebraska: Authorized by the committee of the House of Representatives.

Nishnabotna River watershed, Iowa and Missouri: Authorized by the committee of the House of Representatives.

Boyer River watershed, Iowa: Authorized by the committee of the House of Representatives.

Nodaway River watershed, Iowa and Missouri: Authorized by the committee of the House of Representatives.

Indian Creek, Iowa: Authorized by the committee of the House of Representatives.

Tarkio River Basin, Iowa and Missouri: Authorized by the committee of the House of Representatives.

Very likely the Little Blue River and its tributaries, and Beaver Creek, a tributary of the Republican River, will be added to this list soon.

Lt. Gen. Lewis A. Pick, now Chief of the Army Engineers, has stated in substance that had the Missouri River program been built, it would have protected Kansas City from these recent floods. That program is under way and it should move forward. The Pick-Sloan program is a good program. It will do the job. We want the Agriculture Department's program, too. The Missouri River Basin should move forward with the programs already underway and outlined.

Mr. Speaker, much has been said about conservation. Many fine speeches have been made and articles have been written. It is a subject that has been of major interest to me during my entire congressional service. One of the finest speeches on conservation was made by a minister of the Gospel. I refer to a speech by the Reverend John Fred Streng, pastor of the St. John American Lutheran Church, of Beatrice, Nebr. This speech was delivered on the campus of the College of Agriculture at Lincoln, Nebr., last January. There Reverend Streng said:

The church's people, priority, and prosperity depend directly upon soul and soil conservation. Notice the "U" and "I" relationship in soul and soil. So the church's basic institution for teaching understanding and appreciation of the soil, its meaning, capacity, and limitation, is the Christian home. Parents and children must learn to love the soil. Children are the most important bumper crop; they love to learn. We adults won't change our minds.

When little Ruthie dusts window sills and furniture, and exclaims: "Mother, I hate this old filthy dust," it's time for mother to begin a 3-minute rest period, and utilize

it for a capsuled course in soil conservation. Says mother: "Look, honey, that isn't really filth. God made the dust; it's part of our soil. It's our bread and butter. We belong to the land. If we take good care of it, it will take care of us."

Here is the heart of soil conservation, and the church's future depends on what her God-fearing members do to, and with, God's good earth in time. For, soul and soil erosion are twins.

Rev. Streng went on to say:

How must soil conservation challenge the church. Ninety-five percent of Nebraska churches are rural. And since main street is but the business end of a country road, we may say that all churches in the Cornhusker State are directly affected by changes in agriculture.

I like Rev. Streng's speech not only because it is sound conservation but because he drives home the idea that we should have dominion over the earth, that we should preserve it, and that we should hand it on to the coming generations, a little more productive than it was when we took over. His full speech will be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 1, 1951, on page A1109. If I may quote further from that speech it is:

Volumes have been written on the scientific angle of soil conservation. The church must speak out in simple terms about God's glorious earth and His divine laws which govern summer and winter, sowing and harvest, rain and sunshine, day and night. God wants man to exercise dominion over the earth. And that's a mighty big responsibility. It's a high calling to preside over the mystery of growth in nature.

Mr. D'EWARD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. D'EWARD. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to join the others in complimenting the gentleman from Nebraska on his splendid address today. He has made a real contribution to development not only of the water but of all the resources of the Missouri Basin. I think he will agree with me that there is no difference among any of us as to the need for the development of these resources and the control of the water, but as to how it shall be done. We want it done by the States and the local people cooperating with the Federal agencies.

Mr. Speaker, there are those in and out of Congress who would make use of any event—no matter how tragic—to further their purposes of building a powerful central authority in this country of ours. To me, it is a sad situation when these people would take advantage of the flood disaster that has occurred in the Kansas City area to set up a Missouri Valley Authority.

On July 27 I addressed the House concerning this matter. I stated that under the Pick-Sloan plan for development of the resources we had made great progress in developing and controlling the water resources of the Missouri Basin. Water is the lifeblood of that great area, and growth depends and is limited by the control and use of water.



There is little difference of opinion between those who advocate an authority and those who advance the plan authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1944 as to the need for development of the natural resources of the great Missouri Basin. The difference is as to how and by whom this development shall be carried out. On one hand, there are those who would develop the natural resources by the State and local people in cooperation with the Federal Government. This way is consistent with our heritage and our republican form of government. On the other hand, we have those who propose a Federal Valley Authority. This proposal does not come from reclamationists or from those who know how to farm and irrigate land or develop the great projects which are needed. It comes rather from theorists in Federal bureaucracies who would use the development of this basin to advance their theory of a socialistic government. The authority people propose a powerful agency, superimposed over the State and local government, that would sweep away the rights of the local government and of the people who are supposed to be benefited. It would ignore the Federal construction agencies, the Army engineers, with 150 years of experience, and the Bureau of Reclamation, with 45 years of building such projects as Grand Coulee, Boulder, and many others; the Federal Power Commission; and the agencies of the Department of Agriculture. This involves a struggle that is as old as history: the freedom of the individual versus domination by a centralized bureaucracy.

Recently, bills have been introduced using the flood as an incentive, which would implement an Authority. There has been an effort made to give the impression that these bills have been changed and that some of the bureaucrats control in previous Authority bills has been eliminated. Such is not the case. The sections are being renumbered and rearranged; the salary of the Board members has been increased; the section which purports to protect water rights has been renumbered; a table of comments and chapter titles has been added; delegates or their designated representatives have been added to the powerless advisory council; a new sentence has been added to section 2 which purports to protect the interest and rights of the States, but contains the phrase "shall be recognized by such a regional agency to the fullest possible extent." In other words, there is still nothing binding in the recognition of State and individual rights. There are other changes, but they are minor.

Mr. Speaker, it is my firm belief that those who build these great projects—the Army engineer, the Bureau of Reclamation, and those who have to live under them and operate—the irrigation farmers, and the project managers, do not want a dictatorship such as is established in such proposed legislation. It is my belief that these people know that we have a plan for the development of the Missouri Basin which is sound, constructive, and in the interests of local

people. A living, growing over-all plan, the details of which are fitted into the broad pattern as our knowledge of the resources of the basin increases. The people who live in the basin do not want a dictatorship, but do want a part in the formulation of the plans and a share in the carrying out of the program. They want the resources developed, but in the American way. Sacrificing their rights as individuals and the sovereignty of their States would be too great a price to pay for this development. It is not necessary that they should pay this price. It can be done through the Pick-Sloan plan under which such great progress has already been made and through which development of the great resources in the years to come can be carried out by the local people and their State governments cooperating with the Federal agencies.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I hope I may ask the gentleman a question: Is it not true that we want to proceed with the program already laid out and not back up and start over with a new and untried agency in an area such as ours?

Mr. DEWART. If I am correctly informed the Pick-Sloan plan is the only plan there is at this time; there is no other plan in existence. This is the only plan there is. In fact the bills that have been introduced in this session of Congress recognize that and not only have provisions that propose to take advantage of already existing plans but they intend to use them on an authoritative basis rather than using the individual and the State in cooperation with the Federal Government.

Mr. AANDAHL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. AANDAHL. I repeat what the gentleman from Montana has said and what has been said several other times this afternoon. It cannot be emphasized too strongly that Congress has approved a plan for the development of the water resources of the Missouri River Basin and any shortcomings in the accomplishments thus far can be overcome by making the necessary appropriations to complete the work that has already been planned and designed. It would be a loss of time, it would be abandoning a plan that is most acceptable to the people of the Missouri River Basin, and it would be most unfortunate to change plans at this time. All that we need is the money to proceed with the plan that has thus far been so well outlined. I want to take this opportunity to compliment the gentleman from Nebraska for a comprehensive statement on a point of view very well taken.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] is recognized for 10 minutes.

#### CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, during debate last Friday afternoon on H. R. 4914, a bill to authorize certain construction at military and naval instal-

lations, and for other purposes, the following colloquy occurred and I quote from page 9821 of the RECORD of August 10:

The CHAIRMAN—

Meaning the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, Mr. JACKSON—

The Chair desires to state that he has recognized the gentleman from Iowa for five additional minutes. Does the gentleman from Georgia desire to yield 10 additional minutes?

Mr. VINSON. Yes, give him 15 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman from Georgia desire to be yielded some additional time at this time?

Mr. VINSON. I will give the gentleman full information about the Grandview Airport.

Mr. GROSS. Fine; that is what the public is entitled to.

Mr. VINSON. Grandview is 16 miles south of Kansas City, Mo. It was established in 1944. The field contains 559 acres. It was all under lease. Its planned utilization is in connection with the headquarters of the Central Air Defense Force, headquarters of the Continental Air Command, and one fighter interceptor wing.

Then the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] said this:

The use of these airfields and for what purpose they are being built is classified. I cannot go into it in any more detail and I should not have read what I did read.

Again on page 9822 of the RECORD of August 10, I quote the following colloquy between the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] and myself:

Mr. GROSS. Why are you spending it there?

Meaning \$19,019,000 at the Grandview, Mo., airport.

Mr. KILDAY. I will take some time in a little while and give the gentleman as much as I can. We gave the gentleman some information awhile ago that was classified, and repeated it on the floor.

Near the close of the debate, Mr. Speaker, I was called from the House floor to the telephone and did not hear the opening remarks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] when he obtained the floor.

I now call attention to the remarks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] to be found on page 9837 of the RECORD of August 10, these remarks being read by me for the first time on Saturday morning, August 11.

I quote the following:

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I had not expected that there would be an allegation here that these various bases were located or allocated on any ground of political consideration. The committee, of course, was given a great deal of information that it cannot disclose on the floor. By that we do not mean by any means that we are not perfectly willing to disclose everything we have in a conversation privately to every Member of the House. We regard it as our duty to collect this information that we might be in position to make it available to you.

Here is the justification for the Grandview Airport: In the 95-wing program it will serve as headquarters of the Central Air Defense Force and Continental Air Command; and, as was disclosed by the gentleman from Iowa after we had shown him the restricted records, as the home station of one interceptor wing.

Mr. Speaker, I want this RECORD to show that on page 9821 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 10 that it was the chairman of the Armed Services Committee [Mr. VINSON] who told not only me but the other Members on the floor that the proposed use of the Grandview Airport was for an Air Force command headquarters and station for a fighter-interceptor wing.

At that time, Mr. VINSON said, and I repeat:

I should not have read what I did read.

Also at that time, Mr. VINSON offered for my perusal, a book which he said contained highly classified information.

Mr. Speaker, I want this record to show further that I did not then, or at any time on Friday, August 10, or at any other time, examine a single book, document, record, or paper held by the House Armed Services Committee containing classified information.

The facts as I have related them here, and as completely substantiated by the RECORD, show that it was the chairman of the Armed Services Committee [Mr. VINSON] who stood on the floor of this House and made public the information concerning the proposed use of the Grandview, Mo., airport.

The charge of having disclosed classified information is a serious one. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] should be very well aware of that fact since it was only a short time ago that charges and countercharges were flying thick and fast in the House Armed Services Committee, of which he is a member, concerning an alleged disclosure of classified information.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY], by asserting that classified information was disclosed by the gentleman from Iowa after we had shown him the restricted records, has gratuitously impugned my integrity. Had I not been compelled to be absent from the floor momentarily when that statement was made I would have demanded that the gentleman's words be taken down.

I reassert that the attribution to any Member of the House of having divulged classified information is a serious one and I had hoped that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY], upon reflection and upon his own initiative, would seek immediately upon the convening of the House today to expunge his statement from the RECORD.

Since he did not see fit to eliminate this statement in the revision of his remarks last Friday, nor did he avail himself of the opportunity earlier today to expunge his remarks from the RECORD, I can only conclude that it is his intention to let this false and unwarranted statement stand in the permanent RECORD.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I simply want to state that it is my recollection that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] made exactly the statement that

the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] has attributed to him.

Further, that statement is in the RECORD. I recall very well that the gentleman from Georgia went up to the table in the well and deposited there certain books and invited the gentleman from Iowa to look at them.

Mr. GROSS. That is right, and the gentleman from Iowa did not look at the books.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That is correct, as far as I know.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I remember the incident quite well because I was particularly interested. I remember the gentleman from Georgia coming down with a book and putting it on the table and opening it up. I also noticed that the gentleman from Iowa did not even look at it, and never did look at it.

Mr. GROSS. That is absolutely correct and I thank the gentleman from Missouri, who was present on the House floor through the entire day, for his discerning observation.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

#### CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to check with the gentleman from Iowa to see whether I heard correctly the page of the RECORD to which he referred. Was that 9821?

Mr. GROSS. The first reference was to the remarks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] on page 9822.

Mr. KILDAY. The gentleman read, I believe, from page 9821, beginning with the yielding of the time by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]?

Mr. GROSS. That is right, in the second column on page 9821.

Mr. KILDAY. I followed the gentleman's reading of the RECORD on pages 9821 and 9822, and I believe that he read the quotation exactly correct. However, I want to call the attention of the House to the language appearing on the previous page, 9820, in the first column a little more than half way down the page, where the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] had the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] yield to him, and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] used this language:

I do not want any extravagance in the State of Iowa, simply because we think we ought to have something there. That is not the point. But this Grandview air base at Kansas City; that is a new base and it is to be a fighter base, is that not true?

That was stated by the gentleman from Iowa prior to the colloquy between the gentleman from Iowa and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] as to the purpose for which the base was to be utilized, so that on the page prior to that read by the gentleman from Iowa appears his statement to the effect that the base was to be used for a particular purpose.

Mr. GROSS. That was not a statement, it was a question. The gentleman knows that.

Mr. KILDAY. I do not yield further at this time.

I submit that whether framed as a question or framed as a statement, it was a statement or a question, or at least it contained the information as to the purpose for which this base was to be used, and that in a later colloquy between the gentleman and the gentleman from Georgia that was brought out again. I do not know at what time the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services may have shown the book to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. One further statement and I shall yield.

I do know that the gentleman from Iowa was permitted to see the books by a member of our professional staff, Mr. Smart. As to the element of time, whether it was before his first statement that it was to be used, or the question it was to be used for a fighter base, or later, I will accept the word of the gentleman from Iowa because, frankly, I do not know.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is being careless with the truth. I told him a while ago that I never saw a single paper, document, or record of any kind held by the House Armed Services Committee or anyone else. There is no member of the committee or the staff that can say that I ever saw a paper, document, record, book, or anything else.

Mr. KILDAY. I never said that the gentleman did. Perhaps I am reckless with the truth, but what I said was that I knew that, in addition to the occasion that the gentleman has spoken of, when the gentleman from Georgia showed him books, the employee of the committee, Mr. Smart, had done so. As to the element of time, I did not know, and I would accept the word of the gentleman from Iowa as to when that was done.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. The gentleman says it was not done then, and I accept his word for it.

I will not yield now. The gentleman had his 10 minutes and I want a couple of minutes of my 10.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that the gentleman from Iowa feels, I believe he said, that I had made a bitter and unwarranted attack on him. I was quite surprised when I heard that statement had been made by the gentleman. I went back to the RECORD and read it. I must insist that nothing that I said constitutes such an attack. Certainly down where I come from our skins are not quite that thin. If the gentleman from Iowa feels he has been subjected to such terrible attack, I would recommend that he run for office in Iowa and not in Texas because this would not be regarded as a very bitter attack upon an individual. Our skins are not quite that thin.

Mr. Speaker, I want to refer to the leak in the Committee on Armed Services. I certainly do not condone what



happened there. I resent it as bitterly as anybody in the House of Representatives could resent it. I do not know, and I would not make any speculation, as to who is responsible for it. But it was a totally unwarranted disclosure of confidential information, as highly confidential as the location of the radar screen and the air elements which are to operate in connection with it. As I stated in my remarks a little later on, the same remarks the gentleman read from, the information with reference to the radar screen was rather carelessly bantered about here in the House in connection with the debate. I am highly disturbed because we, in this Congress, are unable to consider matters of such great importance to the security and welfare of the Nation without the facts all being brought out and confidential information disclosed. I made the statements which the gentleman attributed to me. I feel I was justified by his previous revelation of what the base was to be used for. I stand on that on the record, Mr. Speaker.

#### GRANDVIEW MILITARY INSTALLATION

Mr. IRVING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. IRVING. Mr. Speaker, in asking permission to address the House, I have done so because I felt I have a worthwhile contribution to make concerning the Grandview Airport situation which was discussed here last Friday at some length. I am vigorously opposed to the amendment through which the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] seeks to eliminate funds for the Grandview project. The vote will be taken tomorrow on this important proposition and it is my purpose today, by the use of some sound reason and likewise good logic to convince Members of the House to defeat the Gross amendment. The first good reason is that it has not been introduced, in my opinion, in a true effort to economize nor because it is not needed. Evidently, in the judgment of those responsible for the defense of our great Nation, including the Committee on Armed Services, this project is necessary to that effort. I, for one, have confidence in these people in the important matters of the planning for and the selection of strategic locations. I do not set myself as one of the few all-wise men here. It is not my thought in addressing the House this afternoon to malign any person, district, or any of the fine American citizens of any county or State. I feel sure the good people of our county of Jackson will resent deeply the unwarranted attack which has been made on their home county. While this airport is situated in Mr. BOLLING's district, which is the Fifth District of Missouri, and mine is adjoining, or the Fourth District, I still am very definitely interested in this matter. I conscientiously feel that it certainly would be a very valuable

adjunct to the defense program. In no way do I consider it would be useless, or that it is an item of extravagance. Quite to the contrary, I feel for the reasons I will give later, and I am sure you will agree with me, it will be highly useful and is an integral part of the whole program of defense. My colleague from the Fifth District in his remarks in opposition to this amendment had this to say:

It is a matter of regret to me that the proposed installation in Grandview in my district is being used as a vehicle for political attack.

After reading the various statements of the author of the amendment, and the remarks of others who supported him, I am sure no other conclusion can be made. If this installation had been in any other county than that of the home of the President, there is surely the possibility that no objection would have been made nor would it have been noticed by these gentlemen. I have the feeling that the interpretation that will be placed on these unwarranted charges, and this peculiar action, will be that it has been motivated by less sincerity than that of personal animosity toward the Chief Executive as well as the present administration.

I have never been one of those who engaged in bickering back and forth with other Members; and, Mr. Speaker, I shall attempt to keep my record clear along this line.

Mr. Speaker, I feel very deeply about this matter, not only because of the apparent attack upon the integrity of a great many good men, but also I feel that perhaps indirectly I may have been almost solely responsible for this situation in the beginning because of my efforts in 1949 to have the proposed air academy located in Jackson County. I recommended three sites in that county as desirable and suitable for the academy. Thereupon the Air Academy site selection committee visited Jackson County and made a very thorough survey of the above-mentioned sites, finding Grandview as the best of the three. Much data and material was gathered by them, and additional maps and other pertinent information was furnished them by the Kansas City Chamber of Commerce and the real estate board of the same city. It is because of these efforts, inspired by my persistence, that I feel that the Air Force became aware of the value of this location in the very center of the United States. Therefore, in planning our defense effort they no doubt gave this site, as well as many others, proper consideration without any political or partisan influences being involved.

It is my desire to tell you a little more about the Grandview site in order that you may have a more accurate picture than was given you last Friday. I believe there has been already some millions of dollars spent there in its present development. It is on high ground above any floods that might reach it. It lies almost in the center of the United

States. Kansas City is one of the largest railroad centers in the United States. Many of the troops passed through there during World Wars I and II. I believe I am correct in saying that 200 passenger trains move in and out of Kansas City every day. A great deal of freight, as you can realize by comparison, is moved through this city. I think there are 12 transcontinental or large railroads which move in and out of there.

During the present flood there were two trains, exactly, moved out of Kansas City each day for a number of days. The Fairfax airport, which was occupied by the Army Air Force and used by them, and also used by TWA, which is a transcontinental airline, and which was very valuable in transporting needed material and military personnel during the Second World War, uses both the municipal airport and the Fairfax airport, particularly the Fairfax airport as their overhaul base. The Fairfax airport was inundated by the flood, and the municipal airport was very nearly so. The dikes were broken in several places, and only by heroic effort were repairs made which kept the municipal airport from going under water.

As far as the planes were concerned and the use of the planes at this terminal, it was necessary to evacuate it and move them to the Grandview airport to prevent their loss. The Grandview airport, which lies about 20 miles south of Kansas City, was used exclusively for air travel in and out of Kansas City. In fact, I think the President and a number of other high officials when they made their trips to the flood area, were landed and taken off from the Grandview airport. It seems to me that in the case of a great disaster or emergency, which could be a flood of like proportions to the one we suffered, or in case of an atomic bomb attack, this airport adjacent to Kansas City, and yet situated far enough away and on a high-ground position, would be of great value, not only to Kansas City as an international airport, if it should be classified that way, which the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] seems to worry about, but it would give great value to the United States and to our war or defense efforts. He spoke considerably of Sedalia. I know not why. The gentleman apparently has been neither at Sedalia nor at Grandview.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IRVING. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. For the gentleman's information, I attended the University of Missouri School of Journalism at one time.

Mr. IRVING. That is not located at either Sedalia, Kansas City, or Grandview, is it?

Mr. GROSS. What I was trying to tell the gentleman is that I have traveled over the State of Missouri quite extensively.

Mr. IRVING. Has the gentleman traveled to those places since the installations have been put there?

Mr. GROSS. No; I have not seen the base at St. Joseph, Mo., which today is abandoned, which today could be used. It was an active base in World War II.

Mr. IRVING. I desire not to yield to bring in St. Joseph.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Missouri may be extended five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. IRVING. As I say, I do not desire to yield to discuss St. Joe, which was not brought into this debate at all. I asked the gentleman to say whether he had been at Grandview or at Sedalia since the installations had been put there.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IRVING. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I can tell the gentleman that the St. Joseph base will be brought into the discussion later on.

Mr. IRVING. Well, that could be. I think the gentleman has not clarified or answered me as to the other two; however, I am taking it for granted that he has not been there; and, certainly, he could not refer to the Grandview airport as a cow pasture if he had.

The Sedalia air base lies about 70 miles south of Kansas City, and there is only one railroad line that runs to it. I traveled to Jefferson City, which is the capital of Missouri, on several occasions and up there at Knob Noster, which is the correct name of the town nearest to the air base there—I saw hundreds and hundreds of airmen on Saturdays and Sundays trying to hitch-hike rides to Kansas City. Knob Noster is a very small town; it cannot be expected to have too many recreational or cultural advantages, and they wanted to get to Kansas City where we do have them, where we have an art gallery, where we have universities and colleges, where we have veterans' hospitals and other hospitals also excellent libraries, theaters, golf courses, parks and fine churches. I think definitely that the Grandview airport because of its close proximity to these advantages is a perfect location for any kind of a military installation. Not only is it advantageous for reasons of morale but also from the transportation angle being more economical and efficient both for the military personnel, also for the relatives as well. There is going to be a great deal of money spent at Sedalia, and the two can be worked in conjunction, I believe.

I think it is much sounder thinking and that it will save money. If it is not advisable to have it all at Grandview, then have one at Sedalia and one at Grandview as has been proposed in this bill. It will perhaps provide additional protection. In case one were attacked the other would be available. However, in expressing my thoughts, I am saying this without any feeling of

selfishness because as I said at the beginning, Grandview does not lie in my district and I am sure that the people of Grandview have not been too interested in having an installation there. Further, I am sure that the President would not and has not in any way influenced anybody because I think the record will show that there has been no money spent in Missouri since Mr. Truman has been President that was not warranted. There has been no flood of money poured into Missouri, and we are not going to have any indiscriminate expenditure of the taxpayers' money in our State.

I believe conscientiously that this is a good site for the installation that the Armed Services and the defense program have called for.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IRVING. Gladly.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman speaks of conditions with respect to recreation to Knob Noster which existed, I believe, in World War II. Is that what the gentleman said?

Mr. IRVING. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. With the building of the installation at Grandview, Mo., does the gentleman mean to say that is going to solve this problem at Knob Noster where \$22,500,000 is being spent?

Mr. IRVING. I did not attempt to say that, my friend; the gentleman is the one who was worried about Grandview. In supporting Grandview I am not opposing Knob Noster; the people who are in charge of this program probably think there is enough there on the basis of the two locations that they have recommended. It must be borne in mind that wherever these developments are placed, there is going to be considerable military and civilian personnel required for the base, and there is more adequate housing and better facilities in Jackson County than there is in many other areas.

Mr. GROSS. Just how will the creation of an air base at Grandview, Mo., serve to alleviate what the gentleman says is a bad recreational condition at Knob Noster. That is the statement the gentleman made a while ago.

Mr. IRVING. I tell you frankly I do not know, but if you divide 10,000 people between two bases, at least 5,000 of them will have better advantages and there will not be such an overload on the base that does not have as good recreational facilities.

The gentleman spoke of several notable people from Missouri in a critical manner. We do have some very distinguished people coming from Missouri, Kimbrough Stone, Champ Clark, Bennett Clark, Rose Wilder Lane, Dewey Short, Thomas Hart Benton, Arthur Hyde, Mark Twain, and many others. I suppose that they have some very distinguished people coming from Iowa. I can think of two that I am sure the gentleman is very proud of. One is ex-President Hoover and the other is Henry Wallace. So we all have

our distinguished people in the various States.

I congratulate the Department of Defense for recommending this project. I also congratulate the Armed Services Committee for reporting it in this bill, H. R. 4914. It is an important part in our over-all national defense. The authorization of this project should remain in the bill. When the vote on final passage comes tomorrow I urge my colleagues to defeat the Gross amendment.

In conclusion I will say that since taking my seat in Congress I have worked and voted for economy in Government through the elimination of waste, extravagance, inefficiency, duplication, and overstaffing. Further, I have personally practiced economy in the affairs of my office. Therefore, I do not hesitate to oppose the gentleman's amendment because I honestly think the author is on the wrong track in this case. I do desire to compliment the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] upon his efforts to bring about the economies that I have stood for and will say to him that I will cooperate with him and all others in such efforts. His calling to the attention of the House some of the situations where waste, extravagance, and even fraud seem apparent, is highly commendable.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

#### A MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest disasters of the century is now being experienced by the people in the Missouri Valley area—

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. For a question.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman tell me why the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. IRVING] omitted the name of Harry S. Truman from the list of notables who came from Missouri?

Mr. RANKIN. No, but I will give the gentleman from Iowa some information that ought to be more helpful to him, if he will just listen.

As I was saying, the people along the Missouri River and its tributaries are today suffering from one of the greatest disasters of this country, a disaster that could have been averted if the Congress had passed the bill which I have been sponsoring for many years to establish and develop a Missouri Valley Authority, such as we have on the Tennessee. Let me emphasize at this point what I have said time and time again, that the only way to develop the natural resources of that great midwestern area, prevent such disasters in the future, provide navigation on the Missouri River all the



way up to Fort Benton, Mont., supply water for irrigation purposes, conserve the soil, and generate and distribute that vast wealth of hydroelectric power that is now going to waste, is through the development of a Missouri Valley Authority.

I did not attempt to interrupt the "Alphonse and Gaston" demonstrators here today in their discussions of the Missouri Valley Authority. I thought I would wait until I had an opportunity to give the House some information relative to this proposition.

I was coauthor with Senator Norris of the bill creating the Tennessee Valley Authority, and I have fought its battles from that day to this. I am proud of the record it has made. The TVA has wrought the greatest development of ancient or modern times, and if Congress will do the same thing on the Missouri River, you will render the greatest service to the people of the 10 States most vitally affected of anything that could be done at the present time. It would be of immeasurable value, now and for a century to come, to the States of Colorado, Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming—to say nothing of its benefits to the rest of the country.

This water should be used, first, for irrigation. There are untold thousands of acres of land along those tributaries that could be supplied with water for irrigation and soil conservation purposes. I can think of nothing that would be worth more to the arid areas of the Northwest than to have this water available at all times. This Authority would also control the floods on the main stream and its tributaries, and prevent these horrible disasters in the future. It would also provide navigation all the way up to Fort Benton, Mont., and protect the people in that area from exorbitant overcharges in transportation rates; at the same time it would generate more than 40,000,000,000 kilowatt hours of electricity, or more than twice as much as the people in the 10 States in that area are now using, and supply it to them at rates based upon the cost of generation, transmission, and distribution—thereby saving them untold billions of dollars on their electric light and power bills in the years to come.

A valley authority would build dams at the proper places, on the main stream and its tributaries, and coordinate them in such a way as to prevent these flood damages in the future.

In addition to that, it would prevent the flood waters on the Missouri River from synchronizing with the floods on the Ohio and the upper Mississippi and cut the flood crest on the lower Mississippi to such an extent as to save billions of dollars on flood control on the lower Mississippi in the years to come.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield for a question only because my time is limited.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I regret that the gentleman was not here when

we discussed flood control in the Missouri River Basin, and I would suggest that the gentleman investigate the programs that are now on the way.

Mr. RANKIN. I have already investigated them. Let me say to the gentleman from Nebraska that I have followed these investigations for years and years and years.

In addition to that, let me show you what a vast wealth of electric energy is now going to waste in those streams. You will shut the door of hope in the faces of the people of that area for generations to come, if you prevent the development of a Missouri Valley Authority. Why do I say that? There is going to waste now in the Missouri River and its tributaries 41,000,000,000 kilowatt hours of electricity a year, or more than twice as much as those ten States are now using. The year I came to Congress the whole country used only 37,000,000,000 kilowatt hours, or 4,000,000,000 kilowatt hours less than is now going to waste on the Missouri River and its tributaries every year. The same power trust lobbyists that you see swarming around this Capitol now, told us then that we did not need the power in the Tennessee River. They said we did not need any more electricity, that we really had more power than we needed. Last year the people of this country used 329,000,000,000 kilowatt hours, or, approximately ten times as much as they used then, and the demand for more power is greater today than it has ever been before.

At that time I dare say there was not three farm homes out of every 100 that even had electric lights.

Today, as a result of the rural electrification program, that was started by the Tennessee Valley Authority 18 years ago, we now have approximately 90 percent of the farm homes of this country electrified; and the people in the rural areas are living on a standard of which they had never dreamed. I have led this fight for rural electrification during all these years, and I am familiar with its progress in every State in the Union. I do not hesitate to say that it is the greatest economic blessing that ever came to a farm home. It has taken to the farmers of the Nation everything they have in the cities, except the noise and city taxes, lifted the burden of drudgery, brightened the homes and added immeasurably to the strength of the Nation.

This 41,000,000,000 kilowatt hours of electricity that is now going to waste in the Missouri River and its tributaries every year could be firmed up to the peak of the average year with 15,000,000,000 kilowatt hours of steam power, which would raise the production to 56,000,000,000 kilowatt hours a year, or more than two and a half times the amount of power now used in the 10 States affected. That 56,000,000,000 kilowatt hours would be equal to the strength of approximately 24,000,000 men working 10 hours a day 300 days a year. In other words, if every individual man, woman, and child living in those 10 States were a strong man, that power that is now going

to waste would exceed the combined strength of every one of them working 8 hours a day 300 days a year.

You have there a wealth richer than the diamond mines of Golconda; the greatest resource in the area, outside of the soil from which you live.

Do you propose to let this vast wealth continue to go to waste?

Do you propose to have the Power Trust take it over and bleed your people with exorbitant power rates in the years to come?

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield for a question.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. The advocates of the Missouri Valley Authority have not recommended any dam and reservoir to provide irrigation that is not now part of the Sloan plan. They have recommended no dam that is not now part of the Army engineers' program. They have recommended no development of public power. It is merely an attempt to get political control.

Mr. RANKIN. I heard all that "bunk" 20 years ago.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. The program is not that old.

Mr. RANKIN. They used the same argument against the creation of the Tennessee Valley Authority. The Missouri Valley Authority has not been created yet. Therefore, it has not made any surveys; no attempt has yet been made to coordinate that development and make it one great project that would save the people of that area billions of dollars in the years to come. The statement made by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] a few moments ago about the employment of additional "hundreds of thousands of Government employees" by the Missouri Valley Authority was simply ridiculous, as everyone knows who is familiar with the work of the TVA.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I have great respect for the gentleman's opinion on this matter. I wonder, though, if he is aware of the fact that the Tennessee Valley Authority work, as far as this power project was concerned, was all in the blueprint stage of the Army engineers in exactly the way the Pick-Sloan plan is now in the blueprint stage of the Missouri Valley, and that the TVA, as far as power was concerned, was planned by the Army engineers.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Missouri has been misinformed. The engineers of the Tennessee Valley Authority laid down the program and moved forward with the development.

So far as the Pick-Sloan plan is concerned, I think that is the right name for it. It is a plan to pick the pockets of the power consumers under the Sloan program. Under it your people would pay through the nose for the next 100 years in overcharges for their electricity.

I will give the gentleman some idea of what they are being overcharged now.

The householders are not using near the electricity in that area that they are using in the Tennessee Valley area; but they are paying more than twice as much for it as they would be paying in the Tennessee Valley area.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. First, I would like to see if the gentleman would join the States' righters in this thing. In the second instance, does the gentleman have any figures as to how the power users are being robbed in Nebraska?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes, certainly.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. What are they?

Mr. RANKIN. I will give them to the gentleman. This is for 1949. Your residential consumers do not use half as much power per capita as they do in Tennessee, but you would if you had this power available.

The gentleman wants to know about Nebraska. Nebraska paid \$31,000,000 for \$17,000,000 worth of electricity.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. But it was all provided as public power, was it not?

Mr. RANKIN. In other words, you were overcharged \$14,000,000. If you will add that up in bushels of wheat and corn, and divide it out among the counties and let the farmers of that State know what it would take in corn and wheat to pay that overcharge, you will have such a ground swell of support for the Missouri Valley Authority that you will all be apologizing for the rest of the session for the speeches you made here today.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. The gentleman should know there is not a private power company in the State of Nebraska.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand there is not, and if you had this cheap water power in the Missouri and its tributaries available you would save that \$14,000,000 of overcharges every year, and more, for you would use more electricity and get more benefits for less money.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I think the gentleman misunderstood what I was driving at a moment ago.

Mr. RANKIN. Probably so.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Here it is. What I was driving at was this: If you should adopt a Missouri Valley Authority for the Missouri Valley Basin you would go right ahead and take exactly the Pick-Sloan plan to develop the dams and power.

Mr. RANKIN. No, no. We would not do anything of the kind. We would follow the policy laid down by the Tennessee Valley Authority.

As I said, we would develop the navigation of the Missouri River all the way up to Fort Benton in Montana. In that way, if there was any attempt on the part of anyone to reimpose the one-way freight rates we have just got rid of, you

would certainly have a defense. Besides, it would provide you with water rates all through that section. There is no use talking about the Missouri River being any different from the Tennessee River. This water is coming largely from the upper Missouri River and its tributaries. Twenty-five billion kilowatt-hours of electricity goes to waste in the Missouri River and its tributaries above Sioux City, Iowa, every year. All those States are entitled to that power. When you firm it up to the peak of the average year, the chances are that it will amount to 35,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours. It amounts now to more than the entire area is now using. Those 10 States are overcharged \$230,000,000 a year for their electric power today.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield for a question.

Mr. JENSEN. How many square miles are there in the TVA area?

Mr. RANKIN. I do not know exactly. One gentleman from Tennessee says about 80,000. Mr. Speaker, I decline to yield further.

I have got every precinct in every county in the district I represent connected up with the TVA. Where they had less than 1 percent of their farms electrified 18 years ago, today they have about 95 percent of them electrified. Those people are living on a standard they had never dreamed of before. The TVA has developed 600 miles of navigation on the Tennessee all the way from Paducah up to Knoxville. Today the TVA is producing 17,500,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity a year, and distributing it all over that area.

Thank heaven electricity cannot be exported. The power generated on the Missouri River and its tributaries cannot be shipped abroad, but must be used at home. It belongs to the people in that area.

Here is a table showing the amount of electricity used in each one of the 10 States in the Missouri Valley area, the amount paid for it, what it would have cost, and the savings under the TVA rates.

The table referred to follows:

State	Kilowatt-hours used in 1949	Revenues	Area served by TVA	
			Revenues under TVA rates	Savings under TVA rates
Colorado.....	1,427,792,000	\$35,416,100	\$18,407,367.00	\$17,008,733
Iowa.....	3,090,042,000	78,341,900	37,421,575.00	40,920,325
Kansas.....	2,366,305,000	54,010,600	26,703,369.00	27,307,231
Minnesota.....	3,653,635,000	94,490,800	44,506,398.00	49,984,402
Missouri.....	5,006,567,000	105,711,800	55,553,240.00	50,158,560
Montana.....	2,159,178,000	22,425,700	13,548,291	8,877,409
Nebraska.....	1,370,043,000	31,581,100	17,113,326	14,467,774
North Dakota.....	415,919,000	14,919,400	6,119,047	8,800,353
South Dakota.....	448,077,000	14,944,500	5,853,286	9,141,214
Wyoming.....	282,478,000	7,635,400	3,540,280	4,095,120
Total.....	20,220,036,000	459,477,300	228,766,179	230,761,121

If you apply those figures to the 56,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours this Missouri Valley Authority would produce, when firmed up to the peak of the average year, the savings would amount to something like \$600,000,000 a year.

Remember the people on the lower Mississippi have a right to protection from these vast floods which come down the Missouri River, down the upper Mississippi River and down the Ohio. Whenever they synchronize, it means disaster to everything from Cairo, Ill., to New Orleans, La., and below. I am appealing to you as an American, who has carried on this battle for the last 20 years, to join in the fight to protect the people of that great section, known as the Missouri Valley area, from these devastating floods, furnish them with water to irrigate their lands, provide the navigation, to which they are entitled and generate this vast wealth of power to enrich that area for centuries to come.

I have taken more abuse from the Power Trust lobbyists than any other man in the Congress, with the possible exception of Senator Norris. I know what it means. I have not been sectional. I have not tried to discriminate against any area in power development, or in rural electrification, but I have demanded that we extend it to every

farmhouse that can be reached by the draft in time of war, or that the tax collector can find in times of peace. It has made a new day, a new standard of living for the farmers of the Nation.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I supported the gentleman in the Tennessee Valley Authority and all of the hard fights we had. In connection with the Missouri Valley Authority, the gentleman has very ably referred to the marshaling of our natural resources for the benefit of the people. But in addition to that, primarily, there is the protection of life and property.

Mr. RANKIN. That is right.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is the primary thing. Even with that, we prevent this tremendous waste of our natural resources as we did in the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] that this will be of tremendous value from the standpoint of national defense. We had the same opposition when we were trying to develop the Columbia River. I am one man who never flickered. I went all down the line in



support of the development of the Columbia River. What do you suppose we would have done during the last war if we had not had the TVA and the Columbia Valley developments? You would never have had the atomic bomb.

We do not know what is ahead of us. We do not know where we are headed. We do not know what we are likely to get into. We are going to need every one of these streams developed to the last degree in order to protect this country. Because if we keep on, we are likely to find ourselves fighting a defensive battle on our own soil to save America for Americans.

The thing to do now is to develop these streams in the right way. Let us pass the bill providing for a Missouri Valley Authority at once. If there are any provisions in it which you do not like, say so, and we can change them.

As I pointed out, this so-called Pick-Sloan plan would pick the pockets of the power consumers under the Sloan program. The power trust is trying to get its hands on all of the water power of this country. Then they could spiral their overcharges for electricity and run the rates so high that the American people would find themselves in a state of economic bondage.

Let me give you an example. A few years ago the Congress, over my protest, authorized the telephone trust to buy out its competitors, thereby establishing a telephone monopoly. As a result, the farmers' telephones were taken away from them, and rates have been increasing by leaps and bounds from that day to this.

I pay \$6.04 a month for a telephone in my home in Tupelo, Miss., if I never pick up the receiver. The average consumption of electricity for the residential consumers of that city for the month of May was 233 kilowatt-hours, for which they paid \$2.75—less than half the amount I paid for my telephone.

I hope every Member of Congress, and everyone else who reads this Record, will take up his telephone bill and find what this monopoly is charging him for a telephone in comparison with the rates for electric lights and power in the Tennessee Valley area. A man told me today that he had just returned from visiting a relative in Kentucky who lived 6 miles from town and that his telephone bill was \$13.48 a month, if he never picked up the receiver.

I pay as much for a telephone in my apartment here in Washington, if I never pick it up, as I ordinarily paid for both gas and electricity in the same apartment.

Let me repeat what I said in the beginning, that the water power of this Nation is the greatest wealth the American people possess, outside of the soil from which we live. In 1921, as I pointed out awhile ago, the American people used only 37,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity a year. Last year, 1950, they used 329,000,000,000, or approximately 10 times as much as they used then.

We have 394,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of hydroelectric power now going

to waste in our navigable streams and their tributaries every year. It could be firmed up to the peak of the average year with 116,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of steam power—making a total of 510,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours a year, which added to the three hundred and twenty-nine billion used last year, would make a total of 839,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours—which would be enough to operate every factory and every business establishment, electrify every home, and heat every dwelling house in America.

Why should we appropriate untold billions of dollars for similar developments in foreign countries at the expense of the taxpayers of this country, and refuse to develop our own resources and enrich our own people?

I began this battle for cheap electricity for the American people the year I came to Congress, when the Muscle Shoals Dam on the Tennessee River had not been completed. As soon as it was finished, I started the drive to get that power distributed to the people within the distribution radius, and the rates based upon the cost of generation, transmission, and distribution.

One of the greatest supporters I had back in the old days before we created the TVA was a Member from Kansas. I was trying to get the power at Muscle Shoals distributed at a maximum rate fixed by the Federal Government, in order to prevent the robbery that was going on in exorbitant power rates in that area. One of the strongest supporters I had was the distinguished gentleman from Kansas, the Honorable Homer Hoch. His party was in power, and we agreed to have him introduce the bill, which he did. We passed it twice, and two Presidents, Coolidge and Hoover, vetoed it; but later, when we passed the TVA Act in 1933, one of the things I demanded was that we put in it the right of the TVA to fix maximum retail rates for electricity, which we did.

That is the yardstick about which you have heard so much. In doing that we saved the American people billions of dollars on their light and power bills. You are getting the benefit of it. You would probably be paying 25 cents a kilowatt-hour all over Nebraska and Iowa, all over Missouri, all over the country, if it had not been for the Tennessee Valley Authority and its yardstick rates.

Let us not sit here and permit our natural resources go to waste; let us not sit here and let a little group of selfish interests that have their parking place in Wall Street take over the Government and plunder the American people in exorbitant power rates.

In the interest of the people you represent, in the interest of all the American people, I appeal to you to pass this bill creating the Missouri Valley Authority. Let us save our natural resources, promote the prosperity of that great western region, save the southern stretch of the Mississippi River from further destructive floods, and save the people of Kansas and Nebraska from a repetition of the disasters they are now experiencing. Let us develop our own resources,

build up our own country, and save America for Americans.

I thank you.

#### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes tomorrow, following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and to include an editorial.

Mr. GRAHAM, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ANGELL, in two instances, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin, in three instances, and to include extraneous material.

Mr. McVEY, and to include a newspaper editorial entitled "Woe at West Point," from the Daily Calumet, a newspaper of Chicago, Ill.

Mr. JONAS, and to include an editorial.

Mr. BAKER, and to include an editorial.

Mr. GOLDEN, and to include a magazine article.

Mr. D'EWART asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today and include a letter.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin, and to include excerpt from a letter.

Mr. FLOOD in three instances.

Mr. BEALL, and to include an editorial.

Mr. DORN, and to include an article.

Mr. MULTER, in three instances, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BLATNIK, in two instances, and to include an article in each.

Mr. LARCADE, and to include an editorial relating to the Kansas-Missouri flood.

Mr. BARTLETT, in two instances, and to include newspaper articles.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, and to include an address delivered by Mr. Justice Almond, of the Supreme Court of Georgia, notwithstanding the fact it exceeds the limit and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$276.

Mr. RAMSAY, and to include an editorial.

Mr. PRICE, in three instances, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GAMBLE, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HARVEY, and to include an editorial.

Mr. AANDAH, and to include an editorial.

Mr. MANSFIELD (at the request of Mr. PRIEST), and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. YORTY (at the request of Mr. PRIEST), and to include an editorial.

Mr. BECKWORTH (at the request of Mr. PRIEST).

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa, and to include an article by the Baxter International Economic Research Bureau on the question, "How strong is Russia?"

Mr. HOPE, to revise and extend his remarks made this afternoon and include extraneous matter.

Mr. AYRES.

Mr. MEADER, in two instances, and to include extraneous matter in each.

Mr. McCORMACK, and to include an address made by Joseph B. Spang, Jr., president of the Gillette Safety Razor Co., notwithstanding it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$266.50.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for the week.

#### ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill and joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 3782. An act to authorize a per capita payment to members of the Menominee Tribe of Indians; and

H. J. Res. 311. Joint resolution making a supplemental appropriation for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1952.

#### BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill and joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 3782. An act to authorize a per capita payment to members of the Menominee Tribe of Indians; and

H. J. Res. 311. Joint resolution making a supplemental appropriation for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1952.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, August 14, 1951, at 11 o'clock a. m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

709. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a letter relative to a request by Brooklyn College for a donation of the bell of the U. S. S. *Brooklyn* (Brooklyn College is eligible to receive obsolete material from the Navy Department under the provisions of Public Law 649, 79th Cong.); to the Committee on Armed Services.

710. A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a copy of the report entitled, "Development of Areas of Understanding Between the Department of Defense and the General Services Administration"; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

711. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the report

of the Federal Trade Commission entitled "Rates of Return for 520 Identical Companies in 25 Selected Manufacturing Industries, 1940, 1947-50"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

712. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting one copy each of certain legislation passed by the Municipal Councils of St. Thomas and St. John, and St. Croix, V. I.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

713. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of laws enacted by the First Guam Legislature, pursuant to section 19 of Public Law 630, Eighty-first Congress, the Organic Act for Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

714. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal and lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 384. Resolution for consideration of S. 349, an act to assist the provision of housing and community facilities and services required in connection with the national defense; without amendment (Rept. No. 845). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 4027. A bill to provide for an agricultural program in the Virgin Islands; without amendment (Rept. No. 846). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 710. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Suzanne Chow Hsia and her son, Sven Erik Hsia; with amendment (Rept. No. 847). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 711. A bill for the relief of George Lukes; with amendment (Rept. No. 848). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2669. A bill for the relief of Maria Sarandrea; with amendment (Rept. No. 849). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7371. A bill for the relief of Megumi Takagi; with amendment (Rept. No. 850). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3818. A bill for the relief of Yutaka Nakaeda; with amendment (Rept. No. 851). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4688. A bill for the relief of Cecelia Wahls; without amendment (Rept. No. 852). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4756. A bill for the relief of George Francis Hammers; without amendment (Rept. No. 853). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 5131. A bill granting the consent of Congress to a compact or agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey concerning a bridge across the Delaware River to provide a connection between the Pennsylvania Turnpike system and the New Jersey Turnpike, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 5132. A bill to amend sections 1505 and 3486 of title 18 of the United States Code relating to congressional investigations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5133. A bill to liberalize the requirements for appointment in the Nursing Service of the Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GOLDEN:

H. R. 5134. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide retirement benefits for certain former Members of Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 5135. A bill to provide that all fines collected by the United States commissioners in Alaska for traffic violations be covered into the Territorial treasury for the benefit of the Territorial highway patrol system; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 5136. A bill to provide a 15 percent increase in old-age retirement and survivors benefits payable under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DENNY:

H. R. 5137. A bill granting the consent of Congress to a compact or agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey concerning a bridge across the Delaware River to provide a connection between the Pennsylvania Turnpike system and the New Jersey Turnpike, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 5138. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to transfer to the Secretary of the Interior certain lands on which the Seattle Fish and Wildlife Service Laboratory is located; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DEMPSEY:

H. R. 5139. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Fort Union National Monument, in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. Con. Res. 148. Concurrent resolution to establish the Joint Committee on Railroad Retirement Benefits; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Con. Res. 149. Concurrent resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Concurrent Resolution 148; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. Res. 385. Resolution relative to Members' incomes and voting records; to the Committee on Rules.



By Mr. MEADER:

H. Res. 386. Resolution amending rule XI (2) (f) of the Rules of the House of Representatives to authorize committees to establish a quorum of less than a majority for the purpose of taking sworn testimony; to the Committee on Rules.

#### MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Connecticut, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to confirming notification of ratification of the interstate civil defense compact enacted by the State of Connecticut; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States with reference to the interstate compact on civil defense and disaster relief; to the Committee on Armed Services.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOYKIN:

H. R. 5140. A bill for the relief of Doris Mary Pribram; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRAY:

H. R. 5141. A bill for the relief of John Musich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. CHURCH:

H. R. 5142. A bill for the relief of two Missionary Sisters Servants of the Holy Ghost; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FELLOWS:

H. R. 5143. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Edmund Howe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGUIRE:

H. R. 5144. A bill for the relief of Isadore I. Kurhan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H. R. 5145. A bill for the relief of Tsutako Kuroki Masuda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER (by request):

H. R. 5146. A bill for the relief of Helena Shostenko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

383. By Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin: Petition of the Reverend Ernest E. Horth and 40 citizens of Madison, Wis., urging legislation to prohibit alcoholic beverage advertising over the radio and television, in magazines and newspapers, in order to protect children who are being led to believe by such advertising that alcohol is harmless and that crime is glorified; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

384. By Mr. NORBLAD: Petition of Mrs. Nick Humphrys and 15 other residents of

Clackamas County, Oreg., urging enactment of legislation to prohibit alcoholic beverage advertising over the radio and television and in magazines and newspapers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

385. Also, petition of Rev. Paul N. Roth and 31 other members of the Calvary Menonite Church, Barlow, Oreg., urging enactment of legislation to prohibit alcoholic beverage advertising over the radio and television and in magazines and newspapers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

386. By Mr. RABAUT: Resolutions of the Allied Veterans Council of Michigan, Inc., urging certain changes in the Federal Civil Defense Act and certain appropriations for civil defense purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

387. Also, resolutions of the Allied Veterans Council of Michigan, Inc., urging reinstatement of title V of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 and certain appropriations for the Veterans' Employment Service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

388. Also, resolutions adopted by the thirty-second annual encampment of the Department of Michigan, Veterans of Foreign Wars, urging the continuance of the Veterans' Employment Service and the reinstatement of the unemployment features of title V of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

389. Also, resolution of the thirty-second annual encampment of the Department of Michigan, Veterans of Foreign Wars, endorsing the St. Lawrence seaway and requesting the passage of legislation thereon now pending in Congress; to the Committee on Public Works.